

MS Smith
1/2 sheet

THE
CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. CXI.—JANUARY, 1863.

ARTICLE I.—THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE.

Lectures on the Science of Language, delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain. By MAX MÜLLER, M. A.

[BY A. C. KENDRICK, D. D., OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER.]

If familiarity legitimately breeds contempt, it is no just matter of censure that the phenomena of language attract to so limited an extent the curiosity and admiration of men. That which syllabled the swaddled thoughts of budding infancy, which has since been the companion of each waking hour, and which the poet and philosopher share with the peasant, can scarcely be expected to awaken the interest that belongs to objects invested with the charm of novelty.

Yet, observing more closely the nature and functions of language, we can not fail to find it challenging our profoundest interest and study. A material vehicle almost as airy and subtle as the immaterial burden with which it is freighted! A thing as light and evanescent as the air we breathe, yet charged with the high commission of revealing, embodying, and perpetuating all the splendid conceptions of the intellect, and all the sublime mysteries of science! A simple stream of

sound emitted from the throat, and in its passage broken up, articulated, modified by palate, tongue, teeth, lips, breath, and intellect, until it issues forth, no longer a mere mass of sound — *vox et præterea nihil* — but wrought into the complicated mechanism, and rising to the transcendent dignity of rational speech! And as such, behold it running parallel with the manifold movements, and meeting the utmost exigencies of the human soul; impregnated with its reason, glittering with its fancies, blazing with its passion; plunging with it to the profoundest depths of thought, and soaring with it to the loftiest heights of imagination; catching its most delicate lineaments, arresting its most fleeting hues, making palpable its most subtle distinctions, and thus proving itself at once an adequate interpreter of the mysteries, and guardian of the treasures, of the soul. Looking thus at the capacities of language, we can hardly regard as less wonderful than thought itself, the essence in which it is embodied.

As a general rule, the objects which most attract our imaginative wonder are most deserving of scientific research. The connexion between the poet and the philosopher; the facility with which the intuitions of the one are transformed into the speculations of the other; the mutually co-operative play of the fancy and the reason, so splendidly exemplified in men like Pythagoras, Plato, Bacon, Kepler, the Schlegels and the Humboldts, are coming to be universally acknowledged. Yet language, matter of just wonder as it has always been, has but recently been subjected to that severity of investigation which has raised it to the dignity of a science. It is, in fact, substantially the creation of the last half century, and can scarcely be said, with us at least, to have had its christening. Indeed, its scientific sponsors seem quite in doubt how to label their new-born progeny. The current name of Comparative Philology is both cumbrous, and too limited, denoting rather the method and chief instrument of the science, than the science itself. Turning to the Greek, the recognized fountain head of our scientific terminology, we find most of the appropriate words held to previous service in other departments. *Philology* has its sphere in those researches which make language a

means rather than an end ; which, by the blended lights of Grammar, Dictionary, Criticism and History, seek to decipher the records of ancient wisdom and genius, and make our own the literary treasures of past ages. Such is not the purpose of our Science. It deals with language, not with literature. It concerns itself not with what Plato or Cicero thought, but with the nature of the instrument by which their thoughts were expressed. It regards with no higher respect the cultivated dialect of Greece or the sacred language of the Brahman, than the rude jargon of the barbarian. To it all languages are on a level ; or at least, the sole measure of their value is their respective ability to shed light on the laws and natural course of human speech. The terms Mythology (*μῦθος*, *a word*), Phonology, Glossology, Logology, have each their several grounds of objection. It is not unlikely that, after the French *Linguistique*, our scholars may yet resort to Linguistic, or Linguistics, as the designation of their Science. At present we cheerfully forego the indulgence of our classical pedantry, and follow Prof. Müller in a few points of his lucid and admirable exposition of what he unpretendingly calls the Science of Language. We shall find enough of intrinsic interest in its subject matter to enable it to dispense with the adventitious attractions of a name.

And a Science Prof. Müller earnestly claims it to be. As a Science, it passes through the three successive stages common to all sciences—the *empirical*, the *classificatory*, and the *theoretical*; as a Science, it has its fixed principles and invariable laws ; and as a Science, it can claim its high practical uses. On this latter point, indeed, Prof. Müller might seem almost unduly anxious, and hardly to do justice to the generous spirit of true science. We have no fear that that which can be demonstrated to be true, will not demonstrate itself to be useful ; and when our author concedes that if language, as a Science, can urge in its own vindication no higher practical benefits, it must go the way of Alchemy and Astrology, he half admits a lurking fallacy into his argument. Astrology and Alchemy were discarded, not because they were useless, but because they were false ; and in their falseness lay the ground

of their inutility. Such, in human life, is the connexion of all the sciences and all the arts, that no truth can remain permanently barren. A lower form of its application may give place to a higher ; but the truth itself can never be superseded. If the Science of Language has a solid basis, it will prove itself fruitful of benefits, and, apart from its high office of vindicating the dignity of man, and placing an insuperable barrier between him and the brute race, it would be easy to multiply utilitarian reasons for its scientific study. We doubt whether, after the Science which expounds man's relations to his God, there is any whose practical uses are more manifold and abundant.

But there are two classes of Sciences : the one lying within the sphere of the human will, as art, politics, religion, which may hence be called *moral*, or *historical* : the other, *natural* or *physical*, dealing, like Zoology and Botany, with the unchangeable types and phenomena of nature. Prof. Müller puts language into the latter of these categories ; he makes it a strictly natural Science. This view of course excludes entirely the once favorite theory that language was the product of convention — of a synod of rational mutes gathering in high conclave and saying, in voiceless signs, "Go to, let us construct a language ;" while, again, it equally denies that it can, like religion, art, and government, be subject to the fluctuating caprice and arbitrary will of man. And here we must express our doubt whether Prof. Müller does not partially misstate, or at least exaggerate, the difference between the physical and the so-called historical Sciences. A wide difference undoubtedly there is in their subject matter, and in their mode of development ; but assuredly not in the certainty and fixedness of their principles. Religion, politics, and art are as unchangeable in their principles—as completely independent of the arbitrary will of man—as are Geology or Botany ; and it is only in the narrowest and most superficial sense that "an Emperor may change the laws of society, the forms of religion, or the rules of art." The principles of law, religion, and the arts, are as much beyond an Emperor's power to change as are the principles of language, and "a rule in art" he can no more alter than a rule in Grammar.

And so far as a distinction holds between them—and no doubt it is real and broad—we question if language does not lie nearly as much within the sphere of the historical as of the natural Sciences. Its origin is scarcely more a necessary product of man's peculiar organization than religion, or government, or art. It is impossible that men should live a day, without some form of religion and government, and without some of the rudimentary principles of art. These all spring from the original laws and irrepressible tendencies of our nature ; and though, in the actual development and practical application of their principles, they may seem more subject to man's free volition than language, yet the difference is one of degree rather than of kind. The laws which control the growth and decay of art are nearly as mysterious, and as much beyond man's individual or even collective will, as those which determine the growth and decay of language. Who could have legislated Greece into the architectural and sculptured glories of the age of Pericles ? What conscious will ever presided over, or could have prescribed, the course of Grecian or of Roman art ? What edicts of Senates or of Emperors could have essentially modified its progress and development ? Whence came that inspiring breath that toward the close of the Middle Ages rekindled, with almost magical suddenness, the slumbering glories of art, and produced the age of Raphael, Michael Angelo, and Rubens ? We doubt if any single person ever exercised a greater influence over the developments of art than individual great minds have over the progress of language. Chaucer, Dante, Pascal, Lessing, wrought scarcely less effects upon the language of their respective countries, than upon their literature : Pope developed the harmonies of English rhythm, not only for himself, but for all his successors ; and in the modern Greek and the German, the power of a deliberate, collective purpose to reform the abuses and modify the development of a language, has been unequivocally asserted. And as language contains confessedly a material and a rational element, why would not a more exact statement of its nature put it partly into the category of the physical, partly of the historical or moral sciences ?

This, however, is but a minor matter. Language is a Science, and in some very vital features of it, certainly a natural Science. If it is objected to its being so classed, that language changes, while the types of nature are unchangeable — the cell of the bee, the web of the spider, the dam of the beaver remaining in all times essentially unmodified—Prof. Müller admits, nay, maintains, that language does indeed fluctuate with extraordinary rapidity, but always independently of human volition, and on principles of natural growth and decay. A difference is clearly to be made between historical change and natural growth, and it is within the latter sphere that the majority of the fluctuations of language take place. Man may indirectly influence these fluctuations by selecting particular dialects and subjecting them to the artificial restraints of a written literature; but beyond this, he can exercise little control over the free life and boundless varieties of language, and even within these restraints these movements go on without his bidding. The history of all nomadic and barbarous tongues is a history of perpetual and rapid fluctuations: the history of literary languages is a history of inevitable decay and reproduction. The two great laws which, according to Prof. Müller, control these changes, are two, that of *phonetic decay*, and of *dialectical regeneration*.

Language is at first in all its parts distinctly significant: the force of root and termination is in every word clearly perceived and felt. But there is a constant tendency in speech to wear away one or both of these elements, and so to blend their fragments that the force of the separate constituents is wholly lost sight of, and the word makes, as a whole, its collective and merely conventional impression, quite independently of the meaning of its original component parts. The Chinese is nearly the only remaining language which retains the vitality originally inhering in every part of the word, and even in this the traces of phonetic decay are discoverable. But in all literary languages, this principle is acting with such power as wholly to disfigure the original forms of words. We can scarcely, indeed, open our eyes without discovering its operation. It has reduced the Greek *δάκρυον* and the Latin

lachryma to the French *larme*; the Latin *semetipsissimum* to the French *même*; the latin *oculus* to the French *oeil* and the English *eye*; the Gothic *twai tigys* (two decades), to the English *twenty*. It has cut down the Latin *viginta* to the French *vingt*, and has made *viginta* itself a seemingly insignificant form, out of the original elements of *two* and *ten*. Who in ἐπίσκοπος, meaning distinctly *over-seer*, would dream of finding the purely arbitrary *evêque* and *bishop*; in *kyriake*, the Lord's house, would find the unmeaning *church*; or would trace the clipt and crippled forms, *j'ai, tu as, il a*, to the fuller inflexions, *ego habeo, tu habes, ille habet*—while, again, even these comparatively nobler forms are but mutilated remains of demonstrably more complete and significant inflexions? The French *bonnement* is the Latin *bona mente*, with good mind; *fortement*, is *forti mente*; and when a Frenchman says, "*J'insisterai fortement*," he is giving the transformed substitutes for what was once "*Ego insistere habeo forti mente*"—*I have to insist with a firm mind*. Such is the universality, such the virulence of this law of phonetic decay. It often eats away the entire substance and body of a word, and leaves nothing but some miserable fragment, what was originally a mere termination, to express its entire idea. Thus *âge*, English *age*, is the mere ending of a word derived from the Latin *ætas* 'ævitas, without any relic of the radical. The Sanscrit *svasari* (sister), appears in Pehlvi and Ossetian as *cho*, and the Sanscrit *duhitar* (daughter), has dwindled down in Bohemian to *dei*.

But while all inflexional languages are thus experiencing the power of *phonetic decay*, they are acted on by another principle not less powerful, viz: that of *dialectical regeneration*. Human language at first springs forth in spontaneous and even rank luxuriance, and has a constant tendency to throw out new forms, and develop itself in new dialects. It is a common idea that language begins poor, barren, restricted, and gradually enlarges and enriches itself, until it grows into the fulness and power of a cultivated tongue. Precisely the reverse is the fact. A literary language is one which has been accidentally taken out from the midst of the dialects

which surround it, and passing under the restrictions of writing and grammar, is in fact crippled and impoverished, loses its boundless freedom of creation and change, and hence tends inevitably to decay. Thus literary languages are those whose growth has in fact been arrested, on whose free movement and expansion have been placed the bit and curb of writing, and which have passed into an artificial and a necessarily degenerating state.

Of course it is only relatively, and under its more strictly physical aspects, that a written and literary language can thus be branded as inferior. In breadth, in depth, in glow of coloring and substantial power, we suppose a language that has accompanied, assisted, and recorded the intellectual progress and achievements of a nation, is just as much superior to the rude dialect out of which it has grown, or the rude dialects by which it is still surrounded, as the people whose intellectual life it sustains and signalizes are superior to a rude and semi-barbarous tribe. What is meant to be affirmed is, that the language which has subjected itself to the restraints of literature, has lost that freedom of movement, that fulness of forms, that power of rapid change and reproduction, which marks the language that is only spoken into the air and disappears forever. For language is naturally *oral*. Its proper office is the mere communication of our ideas. It is a thing of tongue, and lips, and ear. Written language is an after-thought—an accident, belonging not to the original conception of language, but in fact fettering and reducing it to an artificial existence. It will be seen at once what a change passes over language, when from being the evanescent expression, it becomes the permanent guardian of thought. Both meanings and forms of words, which were before originated and thrown away with prodigal profusion, are now watched over and retained with jealous care, lest the very end of written language should be defeated, and that which is recorded for the benefit of posterity, should in a few generations become unintelligible.

But to return; such is the relation of a literary to unwritten language. It is a single rivulet severed from the great tidal

flow of unwritten speech; but that great stream flows on, under and around it, with scarcely diminished fulness and power, and ready at any time to feed and replenish the failing fountains of the literary dialect. We said scarcely diminished. Undoubtedly the presence of cultivated and literary languages does have a tendency to check the freedom of dialectical growth, within the sphere of their influence. To Europe, therefore, with its numerous cultivated languages, we do not look for the fullest exhibitions of this wealth of dialectical formations. Still, France has not less than fifteen distinctly marked dialects: the modern Greek has perhaps nearly seventy. England is full of "local patois which have many forms more primitive than the language of Shakspeare, and in the richness of their vocabulary often surpassing that of the classical writers of any period." The Frisian, on the northwestern coast of Germany is broken up into an endless number of dialects, so that the inhabitants of small and closely contiguous islands are almost wholly unintelligible to each other. But to see the boundless luxuriance and versatility of language, the rapid multiplication of dialects, we must pass to regions and tribes among which it has been unchecked by any literary culture. Among the African and American tribes, two or three, sometimes even a single generation, will completely change a people's speech, and hamlets separated by a stream or mountain become dialectically strangers to each other.

And in these dialects, so often regarded with contempt by the pedant of literature, as the mere corruptions of his cultivated speech, lies the real vitality and restorative power of language. This everlasting undergrowth poured forth from the fertile soil of language, makes good the losses from decay in the noble forest of speech. Unobserved and despised perhaps, and overlaid by the dominant literary tongue, these dialects still live, infusing into it a sort of secret life, and destined, by and by, when some great political convulsion shall have broken down and swept it away, to emerge into the consistency and dignity of national tongues. Thus the Italian, and its kindred Romance languages, were not the product of the Latin language undergoing a violent death, and

in its death-throes giving a mysterious birth to these, its offspring. They sprang from the various modified dialects of Italy, which lived alongside of the Latin, and they did not need to wait for its death before they were in possession of a vigorous infantile life. "The Latin was a living language long after the Italian had learned to run alone."

But while language has thus its natural and inevitable growth; while it passes through processes of decay and renovation which no human will can control; while, in other words, language is not a historical science, still it is undeniably, in many respects, a child of history. Not only is every internal advancement, but also every outward change, every political commotion of a people, mirrored in its language. The waves of invasion and conquest breaking over a people, leave as distinctly their deposits in its speech, as does the ebbing river its deposits on the soil which it has overflowed. In the French language we can discern the several Celtic, Latin, and Germanic elements, corresponding to the great epochs of its political history. In the English the Celtic, Saxon, Danish, Norman, and, finally, classically Latin elements, would enable the linguistic inquirer, even if its historical records were swept away, to reconstruct, substantially, the grand outline of its history. But though languages may thus be of very diverse origin, we have, properly speaking, no mixed languages. For the determining principle of language is not lexicography, but grammar; and hence no matter how various the origin of its words, from how many different sources they flock in, yet this mere fact does not constitute a mixed language. And however facile may be the dictionary, the grammar is inexorable; she plants herself at the threshold of the language, receives each new comer, compels him to take out papers of naturalization, and swear fealty to the presiding type and genius of the language to which he seeks admission. The immigrants are welcome to bring with them all their internal wealth; but every shred of their foreign costume, every tint and hue of their native grammar, they are compelled to surrender. They are laid upon a bed of Procrustes, and required to stretch or shorten themselves according to its demands. Such is the doctrine

of Prof. Müller. Whether it is absolutely true, may perhaps be doubted. Whether forms such as *phenomenon* and *phenomena*, *criterion* and *criteria*, *index* and *indices*, may not be slight exceptions, and also point to broader innovations which a vast influx of words, like that with which the Norman conquest overwhelmed the succumbing Saxon, may produce in an invaded dialect, we will not undertake to decide. Of the soundness of the principle as a general one, we have no doubt. Just as a powerful nationality will fuse down all the diverse and heterogeneous elements of population into one prevailing type, so will a dominant language mould to its own form whatever foreign material may come within its sphere. Our English language, though much more than half of its words are of foreign stock, is yet by its grammar unmistakeably Teutonic. Its naturalized residents have to bear the German yoke, and the lordly Roman, and the elegant Greek, as they enter its pale, have to assume the costume of the Barbarian whom the one knew not, and the other knew but to despise.

But in yet another way language is historical. Though we are dealing with a natural science, we are dealing with a science which yet lives only within the sphere of humanity, and is subject to all the fluctuations of human history; a science which is as broad as humanity, and in its development follows necessarily the movements and fortunes of the races to whom it belongs. If we would investigate the origin of a word or a grammatical form, we must obviously trace it through all the changes which it has undergone, among the different peoples that have used it, until we may reach its earliest form, in its own special dialect, and may also compare it with other kindred forms in those nearly or remotely related to it. This opens to us the subject of Comparative Philology, as a means at once of explaining the forms, and determining the affinities and classification of languages.

For many reasons this is a science born within our own day. The Greek Philosophers were profoundly impressed with the wonderful nature and functions of language, but they examined it almost entirely in the interests of Meta-

physics and Logic. The necessity of grammatical analysis is but little felt until we come to learn a foreign language. That which we have learned imitatively in our earliest childhood, and which seems a part of our very being, we never dream of regarding analytically. Modes, tenses, cases, we use with an utter unconsciousness of tense, case, and mode, and scarcely, indeed, with the thought that there is any other possible way of expressing our conceptions. The distinctions of Aristotle were chiefly logical distinctions, although, in their deep truth, they subsequently readily adjusted themselves to a grammatical nomenclature. But the Greeks, despising every people but themselves, and affixing to them the common stigma of Barbarians, despised equally every other language. They never dreamed that in any of the numerous tongues that surrounded them, there could be anything which deserved the slightest scientific attention. When Aristotle engaged his royal pupil to send him such specimens in natural history as came within the wide range of his conquests, he seems not to have thought of asking for collections of words which should illustrate the speech and the ethnical affinities of the remote nations of the East. How curious the workings of that philosophic pride which could condescend to monkeys, but could not condescend to men! What a god-send to Leibnitz would have been the friendship, united with the conquering career, of an Alexander!

But if pride goes before destruction morally, it does no less so intellectually. Nothing is so hostile to the genius of true science as the spirit of contempt. Of this incurious and arrogant temper even the sagacious Greek paid the inevitable penalty in the narrowness of his conceptions, and in his want alike of the disposition and the ability to reach those profounder views of language which can spring only from a wide induction and comparison of facts. Could the Greek have forgotten the word Barbarian, and have merged the pride of a clannish civilization in a genial sympathy with humanity, he would have found in the numberless forms of social life around him, problems of profoundest interest. But the garment which arrogant exclusiveness wraps around itself, is

necessarily the garment of ignorance; and the Greeks, having the usages of no other tongue, either to provoke or to aid comparison, could do little for the analysis of language. The Alexandrian critics in settling the text of Homer, had occasion to investigate more carefully some points of grammatical usage, and to enlarge the grammatical terminology. The first regular Greek grammar, however, was constructed for the Roman students of Greek. The Romans were as little able to withstand the power of Greek letters, as were the Greeks to resist the might of the Roman legionaries. Greek was early cultivated in Rome, and to speak and write in this elegant tongue became an indispensable accomplishment of an educated Roman. Thus for foreigners a grammar of the language became necessary, and the need was supplied in the time of Pompey, by Dionysius Thrax, a pupil of the Alexandrian Aristarchus, and residing as Greek teacher in Rome. The grammatical mould into which he cast the Greek, has largely determined the form of subsequent grammars. Long before this, however, in the remote East, the Indian philologists had done the same thing, on a much completer scale, for the language of the Brahmans. All the grammatical principles of that noble tongue had been thoroughly explored, and developed in a manner so accordant with the results of Greek grammatical research, as to prove either the close affinity of the two languages, or the depth and universality of the principles in which grammar has its origin.

Thus far, however, the process is little else than mechanical. We are in the empirical stage of our science; we have not risen above a mere art of grammar. We have thrown a sort of grammatical network over language: we have classified, labelled, and remitted to their respective places, its words and forms of speech; but made no attempt to explain their nature and origin. *ἔτυπτον* means, *I was striking*, and *τύψω*, *I shall strike*; *αἰέω* means, *I was loving*, and *αἰέω*, *I shall love*; *j'ai parlé* means, *I have spoken*, and *je parlerai*, *I shall speak*; the form *I loved*, transfers the action of love from the present to the past: *Athenarum* means, *at Athens*, and *Carthagini* means, *in Carthage*; but how and why this diversity of forms

works these diverse results, no attempt has been as yet made to show. All is purely formal. We pick the flower to pieces with our fingers; we roughly separate with chisel and hammer the different layers or elements of the rock; but we have not attempted to penetrate the deep laboratories of nature, where she is subtly compounding and vitalizing these wondrous organisms. The exploring of the hidden philosophy of language demanded other influences than heathenism could furnish; it belonged legitimately to Christianity.

The clannish and exclusive spirit of Paganism was hostile to the large inquiry and broad inductions of genuine science. It could scarcely raise itself to the dignity and magnitude of questions of world-wide interest. For humanity, as such, it had no concern. The Greeks despised everybody but themselves; the Romans despised everybody but themselves and the Greeks. "It was Christianity," says Prof. Müller, "which first broke down the barriers between Jew and Gentile, between Greek and Barbarian, between the white and the black. *Humanity* is a word you look for in vain in Plato or Aristotle: the idea of mankind as one family, as the children of one God, is an idea of Christian growth; and the science of mankind, and of the languages of mankind, is a science which, without Christianity, would never have sprung into life. When people had been taught to look upon all men as brethren, then, and then only, did the variety of human speech present itself as a problem that called for solution in the eyes of thoughtful observers; and I therefore date the real beginning of the Science of Language from the first day of Pentecost. After that day of cloven tongues a new light is spreading over the world, and objects rise into view which had been hidden from the eyes of the nations of antiquity. Old words assume a new meaning, old problems a new interest, old sciences a new purpose. The common origin of mankind, the difference of race and language, the susceptibility of all nations of the highest mental culture, these become, in the new world in which we live, problems of scientific, because of more than scientific, interest."

It is true that the new principle remained for some time

comparatively unfruitful, and much labor had yet to be wasted in misdirected inquiry. The Hebrew, with its cognate languages, standing in sharp contrast with the classical tongues, shared with them the attention of scholars; and the endeavor to establish the claims of Hebrew to be the language of Paradise, absorbed not a little of the learned industry of the middle ages. Yet this industry was not wholly wasted; for as the labors expended on the fancied sciences of Alchemy and Astrology, either originated or advanced the genuine sciences of Astronomy and Chemistry, so these zealous endeavors to determine the original language of the race, though resting on wholly false assumptions, and pursued by false methods, yet accumulated vast material for the future structure of the Science of Language. The Lord's prayer, translated into every language reached by the missionaries, laid a good foundation for mutual comparison.

The first clear exposure of the futility of the prevailing inquiries, and opening of the right method, is due to the sagacity of Leibnitz. He rudely shivered the idol of the Hebrew worshippers, by declaring that Hebrew had just as much claim to being regarded as the primitive language as the Low Dutch, and he saw and urged the necessity of collections of words from all languages, for the purpose of comparison. He corresponded with Eastern Missionaries on this point, and becoming acquainted with Peter, the Czar of Russia, he wrote to him, urging him to use his royal authority in procuring vocabularies of the numberless dialects spoken throughout his vast European and Asiatic dominions. His efforts were not in vain; and even the Empress Catherine, Peter's successor, did not disdain to devote herself assiduously to the work both of collecting and classifying these vocabularies.

In the year 1800, Hervas, a Spanish Jesuit, for years a Missionary in America, and then resident at Rome, where he had access to returned Missionaries from all parts of the world, published, as part of a large work, a work in six volumes, containing a catalogue, with specimens, of 300 languages. He himself prepared grammars of more than 40. He was the first to point out the affinities of languages as dependent

rather on grammatical than verbal relationships. He proved that Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Amharic, were all dialects of one mother language, the Semitic. He perceived clear traces of affinity between the Hungarian, Lapp, and Finnic dialects; that the Basque was not Celtic, but independent of, and anterior to, the Celtic; and he discovered the vast extent of the Malay and Polynesian family of speech. He discovered the similarity between Greek and Sanscrit, though his imperfect information prevented his seeing the full significance of the discovery. Hervas was followed with still more complete collections by Adelung, in his *Mithridates*, who drew alike from Hervas and the labors of the Empress Catherine. His first volume was published in 1806; the two last, after his death, by Vater and the younger Adelung, in 1814-15. His arrangement of languages was still defective, being mainly geographical, rather than based on internal affinities.

The study had now reached a point at which it might easily receive an electric and decisive impulse. That impulse was furnished by the Sanscrit, whose full discovery armed scholars with the noblest weapon of Philological Science. Known at an early period, the sacred language of the Brahmans (whose written language is now demonstrably traced back to at least the fifteenth century before Christ) had been a subject of deep curiosity. The first European scholar of Sanscrit, known, was Roberto di Nobili, in 1606. In 1740, Father Pons drew up a comprehensive account of Brahminical literature, and in 1790 published the first European Sanscrit Grammar. Sanscrit philology, however, dates properly from the founding of the Asiatic Society, in 1784. Sir Wm. Jones, Carey, Wilkins, Foster, Colebrooke, were among its chief promoters. Sir Wm. Jones (who died in 1790) was the first to discover the extent of the relationship of the Sanscrit to the Greek. No Philologist, he declared, could examine the two without the conviction that they were sprung from a common source, as well as perhaps the Gothic and Celtic.

The discovery wrought like magic, and certainly took the learned world by surprise. It fell like a thunder-bolt into the

magazine of their crude theories and speculations, exploding them in every direction. That among the dark-faced semi-barbarians beyond the Indus, there was a language vying in richness and delicacy with the refined and elegant Greek, and fraught with ample literary treasures, overturned almost every cherished notion. Dugald Stuart declared that the language was an imposition — a macaronic invention of some Indian Psalmanazzars. Lord Monboddo woke up from his dream of transformed and man-*aping* monkeys, to make still some judicious speculations on the new discovery. Its fruits, however, were first, and rapidly reaped on the continent. Frederic Schlegel saw the far-reaching principle of relationship that now united the Indian and Western languages, and with the intuition of genius, riveted them together by the comprehensive name of Indo-Germanic tongues. He was followed by a host of other able men. His brother Augustus William, and William Von Humboldt, both lent their great influence and learning to the promotion of Sanscrit Literature and Comparative Philology. Prof. Bopp followed, with his great work in Comparative Grammar, of which he published the first volume in 1833, and the last in 1852. Pott's Etymological Researches, Grimm's German Grammar, a work of twenty years, followed in the same footsteps. Meantime Rask, a Dane, had visited Persia to study the Zend Language, but died before publishing the results of his researches. His labors were taken up by Eugene Burnouf, whose profound knowledge of Sanscrit and of Comparative Philology enabled him to translate, from the original, the Zend Avesta of Zoroaster. It had been previously translated from a modern Persian version, by Anquetil du Perron.

Into the labors of these men many able scholars have entered, and prosecuted the science with a zeal and success which make it difficult to keep pace with it. The names of Prichard (who showed the Indo-European affinities of the Celtic language), of Garnett, Bunsen, Aufrecht, Schleicher, Diefenbach, Curtius, Max Müller, we can barely mention as among the leading promoters and representatives of this rapidly advancing study.

The fruits of their studies have been equally various and important. First, they have resulted in a genealogical classification of numerous large groups of languages, demonstrating both their affinity, and the nature and degree of their affinity. The principles brought to light in settling the precise relations of the Sanscrit to the other Indo-European tongues, shed a flood of light on the mutual relations of them all. An extended induction showed the same original principles and forms of inflexion running through these languages, and having thus restored the primitive structure from which they all had deviated, it could determine their relations, both to each other and to the original. Thus, in the verb of existence *asmi*, it was seen that while the Sanscrit *asmi* and Greek *ἐσμι* are more primitive than the Latin *sum*, the Greek *ἐστε* and the Latin *estis* are more primitive than the corresponding Sanscrit *'stha*, and again the Latin *sunt* more primitive than the Greek *κῆντε* or *εἰσιν*. *Sunt* could never have been derived from *κῆντε* or *εἰσιν*; but both *sunt* and *κῆντε* could be derived from the Sanscrit *asanti*. By this process it was discovered that Sanscrit was not the parent, but a sister, perhaps an elder sister, of the Greek and Latin; that the Latin was not the daughter, but the sister, and indeed an elder sister, of the Greek, being, though later in its literary development, yet more archaic in its forms than its classical rival. It was discovered that the Romance languages were not the daughters of the Provencal, as maintained by the able work of Raynouard, but had sprung along with it from the Latin, or rather from those Italian dialects of which the classical language of Rome was the literary expositor.

We have then, as the first result of this wide induction, a very large *genealogical* classification of languages, based on verbal and grammatical affinities. Geographical lines have disappeared; new laws of union and separation have taken their place. The magnetism of linguistic affinity has drawn together tongues the most widely separated in space, and to a superficial eye, in character; and united in one vast family, with their various subordinate branches, nearly all the cultivated dialects between the Ganges and the Atlantic Ocean.

In and near the Arabian peninsula, we have the before-mentioned Semitic group or family of languages. But now in Asia, the Sanscrit and the Persian, the dialects of Afghanistan, Bokhará, Kurdistan and Armenia, join hands with the widely spread Slavonic family of Eastern Europe, with the Germanic groups in Central, and the Scandinavian groups in Northern Europe, with the Greek and the Latin in the South, with the daughters of the Latin, the Italian, French, Spanish, Portugese, Wallachian, and Roumansch, with the English, as essentially Teutonic, and with those Celtic dialects which still retain a lingering, though failing foothold in those narrow coast lands and mountain fastnesses to which mightier tongues and civilizations have driven them.

But while thus linking together vast families of speech by geneological affiliation, and harmonizing the discords of the great Babel of human utterance, Comparative Philology has accomplished still other most important results. It has investigated in the most searching manner, and established on a scientific basis, the laws of phonetic change and of verbal affinity. It has thus re-cast the whole subject of etymology, consigning to the tomb of the Capulets all the crude guesses of earlier time, dissipating at a breath the superficial relationships based on mere accidental resemblances, and bringing up out of the profoundest laws of speech a new set of radical affinities. *Feu* is not connected with the German *feuer*, but, through the Italian *fuoco*, is traced back to the Latin *focus*. *Ἥδῃ* is brought into connexion with the Latin *jam*: *of* stands in line with *ἀπό* and *ab*. *Zeus* stands connected with *dies*, through the Sanscrit *Dyaus*, the God of the upper sky. Undoubtedly the ablest Etymologists are also the most modest, and feel that they are liable to be often led astray by false lights; yet Comparative Anatomy does not more completely establish the relationship of widely severed animal structures, than do the far-reaching and rigorous methods of Comparative Philology gradually build up a true Science of Etymology.

This process accomplishes yet more. It reveals the nature of those tense and case endings which were before sup-

posed to be purely conventional, and finds them to spring from pronominal or other significant words, which in the decay of language have been worn down so as to have lost nearly all traces of their origin. Following up words to their earliest forms in the tongue to which they belong, and then comparing these with the forms in more nearly or remotely kindred dialects, it arrives at the secret of their origin and composition. Language now becomes all instinct with life: the previously dead form is imbued with vitality, and every element of language, every part of the word, is found to have been originally (what from the nature of speech might have been supposed) the offspring and vehicle of a thought. The *d*, in *I loved*, carries us back to the compound form *I love did*. The Latin *amabam* and *amabo* are made by attaching to the radical *ama*, parts of an old verb of existence which appears in our verb *to be*. *Amavi* is made up from *ama* and *fui*. *Ἐφίλησα* and *φιλήσω* make their endings, *σα* and *σω*, from another verb of existence, *syā*. The French future, *parlerai*, is made by attaching to the infinitive, *parler*, the present of *avoir*, *parler-ai*, *as*, *a*, &c. The personal inflexion of verbs is made by combining with the root the oblique cases of the personal pronouns, as *δίδω-μι*, *δίδω-σι*, *δίδω-τι*, *the giving of me, I give*, &c.; which have left here and there palpable vestiges in languages from which they have been almost entirely abraded, as in the English word *loveth*, now changed into *loves*, and in the French *aime-t-il*, in which *t*, instead of being an arbitrary euphonic insertion, is the old termination saved by euphony from ejection. The endings of the cases are in like manner explained from significant roots. *Δήμου* is from *δημόσιο*, an adjective termination, marking the original adjective force of that generic or predicative case mistranslated the *genitive*. *Sermoni* (with locative *i*) meant, originally, *in speech*, as *Carthagini* has still the locative signification, *in Carthage*. This induction has been carried so far as fully to warrant the conclusion that all inflexions were originally formed by significant terminations, even where they cannot now be fully made out, and that thus language was originally "vital in every part."

But having thus resolved words into their elements, we reach forms which obstinately resist all further analysis, and hence are treated as radical. Words, then, are regarded as made up of two roots: *Predicative roots*, which form the body of the word, and *Demonstrative* or pronominal roots, which specialize or limit the others by adjuncts of place, number, person, time, &c. These roots Prof. Müller divides into three classes: *Primary*, consisting of a vowel, or of a vowel preceding or following a consonant: *Secondary*, of two consonants inclosing a vowel; and *Tertiary*, of two consonants and a vowel, of a vowel and two consonants, of two consonants a vowel and a consonant, or of two consonants, a vowel, and two consonants. The primary roots are the most important; but their general import is slightly modified by the consonants of the secondary and tertiary roots. From these roots, flexible and prolific, expressing always general ideas which admit of indefinite analogous applications, a vast and all-sufficient frame-work of language is easily constructed. We have but to take the Latin root *spec*, and its Greek cognate *σπερ*, to see the vast flexibility and pliancy of one of these predicative roots. Run it through its innumerable Greek derivations, whence come sceptic, scope, episcopal; through the vast range of Latin forms, as species, special, specific, respectable, speculation, circumspect, expect, auspicious; see it turning up, by accidental association, in the French *espiègle*, waggish, and *épiciér*, a grocer; in the Italian *spezieria*, an apothecary's shop, and the English *spices*; and we get a little idea of the thriftiness of Mother Nature in turning to account the linguistic materials entrusted to her *ménage*. Sanscrit grammarians have reduced the whole growth of their language to about 1700 roots, which Prof Müller thinks may be still reduced to about 500. The Hebrew has about as many, and the Chinese is satisfied with about 450. This, says Prof. Müller, shows a wise spirit of economy in primitive language, for the possibility of forming new roots was practically unlimited, since with only twenty-four letters, the possible number of biliteral and triliteral roots is about 15,000. Now from 500 roots, assuming that each root gave rise to fifty words, we should get a vocabulary of 25,000. Yet a well educated Englishman

rarely uses more than 3,000 or 4,000 words, in actual conversation, although eloquent speakers, and acute dialecticians may rise to about 10,000. The Old Testament utters its revelations with less than 6,000; Milton contents himself with 8,000; and the limitless range of Shakspeare's genius employs but 15,000. But along with these predicative elements, we also need the demonstrative elements, for the formation of words. We must have not only the root *luc*, *shine*, but this, with the pronominal element *s*, *luc-s*, shining there, *light*; with the second person of the pronoun, *luc-e-s*, thou shinest. These two elements are essential to make up language; and it is absolutely certain that every inflected language was once in a state in which both these elements were clearly visible.

Armed with this doctrine of roots, we may now resume our work of classification, and make our onset upon those languages which were proof against any verbal affiliation. Nothing, we have seen, is more changeable than the words of a language when bound down by no political organization, and by no written literature. It creates and throws away forms with reckless prodigality, and hence it is in no way surprising that the dialects of barbarous and nomad tribes should display slight traces of verbal affinity. But they cannot emancipate themselves from the general law of language. They cannot form words on radically different principles from those which have been already examined. All speech must consist originally of these two classes of roots—the general, fundamental or predicative, and the demonstrative or specializing. These roots may co-exist in three different ways: 1. Both the roots may remain entirely unmodified and distinct. 2. One of the roots may retain its integrity, and the other be worn away or modified. 3. Both the roots may have been so modified, worn away, or blended with each other, that their distinct form is lost. The first class, in which both roots are distinct, is called *monosyllabic*; the second, in which the changeable ending is as it were glued to the root, is called *agglutinated*; the third, in which both the parts are liable to be fused entirely into a new compound, is called *inflected*. We have here a principle of classification absolutely exhaustive. In some

one of these stages all languages must be found ; those which are in the second have reached it by passing through the first, and those in the third by passing through the first and second. Of the first, or monosyllabic stage, the chief specimen is the Chinese: to the third, or inflexional stage, belong all the Indo-European languages: while the so-called Turanian, comprising the numberless dialects spread over Central and Northern Asia, and a few sporadic European tongues, islanded in the encompassing ocean of Arian speech, belong to the agglutinated class.

If it is doubted whether, as these seem to have the fixedness of a permanent type, they are not in reality three originally distinct classes of speech, it is answered that it can be demonstrably shown that the inflected languages must have once existed as agglutinated and monosyllabic; that the Chinese exhibits symptoms of that abrasion which approximates it in some points to the agglutinated; while some of the Turanian dialects, as the Turkic and Finnic, having considerable literary culture, have also so far taken on the inflected form as to stand nearly midway between the inflected and the ruder Turanian dialects.

Thus the languages which escape the genealogical classification, submit to the *morphological*. Where they do not display affinity of words, they display affinity of origin and original construction; and when we add that the same principle applies to languages which, like many of the African and American, are *polysynthetic*, or consist of many roots, we find we have now a principle of classification which applies absolutely to all languages.

Having reached an ultimate analysis, by virtue of which we may unite all languages under this common law of classification, we are prepared to see what light our science sheds on the question of the common or diverse origin of human speech. Prof. Müller insists on keeping the problem distinct. He will confound it with no theological, and with no other scientific questions. It is not an inquiry into ethnical affinities, nor into the original unity of the human race. Men may have had, he thinks, diverse origins, and yet the language

of one people have gained an ascendancy over and supplanted all others. Or all nations may have sprung from one original source, and yet language have broken out at different times, and with a complete diversity of verbal forms. Thus the original unity of language is really a question by itself alone.

Both of the above positions are undoubtedly conceivable. But they are so violently improbable, that, like the infinitesimal elements in fluxions, they may with entire safety be neglected in our calculations. Men will always regard the questions of the original unity of language and the original unity of the race, as *de facto* identical. If, indeed, we accept a theory which Prof. Müller unconditionally and contemptuously rejects, viz., that language is a matter of arbitrary agreement, the product of a body of speechless sages, agreeing together to originate a vehicle of inter-communication, then we see not why there might not be as many independent tongues as there were bodies of mute bipeds who should happen to combine for this high purpose. But if such a theory is as absurd as, with Prof. Müller, we suppose it to be, and if language is really a natural and necessary product of the unique human organism, then the two questions can never be so disengaged from each other that the solution of one will not involve the virtual solution of both. Meantime we concur entirely with Prof. Müller in the propriety of examining the question wholly apart from any extrinsic considerations, and especially from any theological consequences supposed to be involved in it. Science must reign supreme in its own department. It must be allowed to tell its own story — to render in its own unforced and unbiassed testimony. The moment that we bring either fear or favor to bear on the witness whom we have placed on the stand, his testimony is worthless in our favor, while we raise a violent suspicion against the soundness of the cause that needs such supports. Prof. Müller, though a firm believer in the common origin both of language and of the race, yet concedes that, scientifically, the question is yet unresolved. He contends, however, that from the diversity of languages, no *impossibility* of their common origin has been or can be shown, the nature and degree of their diversity be-

ing perfectly otherwise accounted for. On the kindred subject of the common origin of the race, he says, incidentally, and, as we think, with great justice:

"If I am told that no quiet observer would ever have conceived the idea of deriving all mankind from one pair, unless the Mosaic records had taught it; I must be allowed to say in reply, that this idea, on the contrary, is so natural, so consistent with all human laws of reasoning, that, so far as I know, there has been no nation on earth which, if it preserved any traditions on the origin of mankind, did not derive the human race from one pair, if not from one person. The author of the Mosaic records, therefore, though stripped before the tribunal of Physical Science of his claims as an inspired writer, may at least claim the modest title of a quiet observer; and if his conception of the physical unity of the human race can be proved to be an error, it is an error which he shares in common with other quiet observers, such as Humboldt, Bunsen, Prichard, and Owen."

But passing from the inductive, we reach the last and *theoretical* stage of our science, which deals with the ultimate nature and origin of the radical elements into which our complex speech has been resolved. What are these roots, so wondrous in their character, and how and whence were they originated? In other words, we now take in hand the difficult problem of the origin of human speech.

1. Let us state the different suppositions. Is language the product of conventional agreement—men going to work to construct it as they would to build a city—the deliberate product of the felt need of an instrument of social intercourse?

2. Is language a direct gift from God, superinduced upon man's primary faculties, as a sort of dowry with which to set up his rational and social house-keeping?

3. Is language the immediate, spontaneous, natural product of his blended material and rational organism, and does he speak by the same rational instinct by which he thinks? Is it a part of the very idea of man to speak, as of a singing bird to sing?

The doctrines involved in the two first questions, held as they have been by many very able men, may be regarded as effectually exploded. Language is not a matter of subsequent convention, for men must have spoken before they could have agreed to speak. And certainly they must have been created

with the *faculty* of speaking; they could not have invented *that*; and supplied with the faculty, there is no more theoretical difficulty in supposing the first man to have spoken than the second, nor to have spoken on the first day of his existence than on the ten-thousandth.

The second doctrine, though vouched for by many learned men, is little less objectionable. In one sense assuredly language was, like all man's other endowments, a divine gift. But to suppose him to have been first made, and then the faculty of speech, or an actual vocabulary miraculously conferred upon him, is little less than absurd. A being without the faculty of speech was surely not man: *with* the faculty of speech, why not leave him to the natural exercise of this, as of his other faculties? Why assume a miracle to supply what belongs to him by the very laws of his being? And if it was necessary for God to provide him miraculously with a language, it would seem equally necessary to furnish him miraculously with the means of understanding it. What he had the faculty of comprehending, we do not see why he had not the faculty of originating.

Is language then an immediate, natural, necessary product of man's peculiar rational constitution? Is rational speech as much the offspring of the higher human organism, as their natural inarticulate cries are of the lower, irrational nature of the brutes? So we firmly believe. To our mind all the facts and phenomena of language tend irresistibly to this conclusion. The intimate connection between reason and speech is clearly shadowed forth in the Greek word *λόγος*, in which, with characteristic sagacity, that marvellous people seem to have divined the true nature and origin of language. It is involved in that law of the human mind which makes it an almost utter, if not an absolute, impossibility to pursue any extended process of thought, to perform any act of generalization, and hold together any set of complex ideas, without the aid of language. We almost doubt whether man can have a clear and distinct conception, even of an individual object, without investing it with a name; we are quite sure that he cannot, from the very nature of his organization, pursue any distinct

line of thought without language, and the first distinct and full-born thought that visited humanity signalizes, we believe, the birth-hour of language. The one is not a whit more mysterious than the other. If he could *think*, why could he not *speak*? That is to say, He who made him capable of the act of thought, could also make him capable of the accompanying act of speech. At this point, in speech and reason, man completely parts company from the brute. Brutes have, as Aristotle would have said, the nutritive soul and the sensitive soul in common with man. Like men, they see, hear, smell, taste and feel. Like men, they remember and desire, love and hate, cherish gratitude and revenge. In many respects they have a sort of shadowy and dream-like imitation of the higher life of humanity. But wherever and however we are to draw the precise line, there is a broad, distinct, undeniable line between the brute and the human world. This line lies, too, not merely and not, perhaps, primarily in the *moral* attributes of humanity. It lies in those *rational* attributes which alone constitute any fitting basis of moral responsibility. It matters little in truth where we draw the line theoretically. The barrier which rational speech raises between man and brute is one which no brute has ever made the slightest attempt to overpass, or in which it has taken the first step that brought it nearer to humanity. Brutes never took a step toward organizing a civil government; never conceived the idea of constructing a printing press, or establishing a newspaper; never produced the first line of an epic poem; never thought of having their daguerreotypes taken, for the comfort of their posterity; never went abroad on travels of discovery, nor established learned societies for the purpose of promoting and registering the progress of science. To think of the most highly educated dog taking his seat in a session of learned pundits, and gravely bow-wow-ing his dissent from some theory respecting Sir William Hamilton's analytic! Brutes may be immortal. For ourselves we do not believe it. We believe that it takes a deeper, broader, stronger volume of life than swells in the soul of a brute to roll through the sands of time into the ocean of eternity. But be that as it may, rational speech, *i. e.* rea-

son with its attendant speech, speech with its parent reason, form a barrier between the two orders of existence which brutes cannot elevate themselves, nor men sink themselves sufficiently, even to dream of crossing.

A just view of the origin of speech virtually disposes of two other questions, viz: by what law, in what manner, these verbal roots originated. Were they originated on the principle of imitation, a doctrine which Prof. Müller with quiet contempt designates as the "bow-wow" theory; or did they originate in interjections, which doctrine he marks as the "poo-poo" theory? The latter is not worth a moment's notice; for where the language of interjections ends, rational speech really begins. The former, too, has very little to say for itself, so long as the imitation is restricted to the imitation of the coarse, palpable sounds of external nature. A language so constructed, could go but a small way towards supplying the manifold demands of man's rational soul, for words framed on the strictly imitative principle, like *cuckoo*, are the most unflexible and least prolific words in language, and admit hardly any extension to general ideas. Neither the facts nor the philosophy of the case warrant our regarding the vast, magnificent, spiritual structure of human speech as built up out of the very meagre materials furnished by the onomatopœtic or *bow-wow* principle. Take a simple illustration. If any word would have been *bow-wow-ically* formed, it would have seemed likely to be *thundr*. And yet *thunder*, *donner*, *tonitru*, formidable sounding words as they are, are demonstrably from a Sanscrit root *tan*, to stretch (in which the roar and rumble are not heard at all), and are actually identical in origin with *tendre*, *tender*, and *thin*. Thus dissolve away onomatopœtic dreams, under the wand of Etymology.

For a modified form of this theory, there may perhaps a good deal be said. That there is in the mind a certain connection between specific ideas and certain combinations of sounds—which would, for instance, select vowels and liquid or softer consonants for softer conceptions, and harder and harsher elements for a corresponding class of ideas—seems hardly deniable; and that this principle may have operated to no

slight extent in the original production of roots, we see no reason for denying.

But recurring to the origin of roots, it has been a question whether the first words were general, or specific: whether men first named an individual cave, and then transferred the name to all caves; or whether they first invented the general term, and then gave it an individual application. Prof. Müller virtually combines and harmonizes both views. The actual name was first given to the individual; but the name itself was generic; it expressed a generic idea; that is, it was founded upon some property or attribute of the object named. Thus *antrum* is a kindred form to *internum*. The cave was so designated, because it was the man's *within*—the same idea which led also to the name *ἐντερον*. Under another aspect, from *cavo*, to *hide*, it was his *cavea*, his cave, his hiding place. Thus all names were originally predicative roots. They predicated some general quality or attribute of some particular thing. And hence their exceeding fruitfulness, being general terms which, by the flexible operations of the human mind, were capable of being applied to any object where it could discern the same, or a kindred, or an analogous quality.

We thus track language up to its last hiding place. It is the immediate, natural, instinctive product of man's physical and rational organism — it is an invariable and inseparable concomitant of his rational faculties and processes. It consists of general or predicative roots, expressing some generic idea, and applied to a specific object, by the aid of demonstrative roots, which specialize and localize them. "These roots," says Prof. Müller, "consist of *plastic types*, produced by a power inherent in human nature. They exist, as Plato would say, by nature; though, with Plato, we should add that when we say by nature, we mean by the immediate hand of God. There is a law which runs through nearly the whole of nature, that everything which is struck, rings. Each substance has its peculiar ring. We can tell the more or less perfect structure of metals by their vibrations, by the answer which they give. It was the same with man, the most highly organized of nature's works. Man, in his primitive and perfect state,

was not only endowed, like the brute, with the power of expressing his sensations by interjections, and his perceptions by onomatopœia. He possessed likewise the faculty of giving more articulate expression to the rational conceptions of his mind. That faculty was not of his own making. It was an instinct, an instinct of the mind as irresistible as any other instinct."

On the theory here advanced we have no special criticism to offer. We have obviously passed the sphere of induction, and are in that of speculation. Whether the "ringing" doctrine be true, or whether, without it, speech was produced by a rational instinct, we shall not undertake to determine. We see no necessity of it; nor, perhaps, can any serious objection be urged against its assumption. When we have followed up the stream of speech thus far, we may well admit that it has some mysterious head-waters, which will never be unveiled to human view. One conclusion, we believe, follows irresistibly from the researches we have so imperfectly sketched. The first man was the archetypal man, at once enfolding all the germs, and exhibiting all the high attributes of the race. That man was not thrown out forlorn and miserable upon the wild; that he did not commence his career a mute, pitiable, savage troglodyte, and, through millions of ages, work his way up with his brain and his ten fingers, gradually inventing, as he went along, government, language, art, religion, until, after myriads of milleniums, he stood forth equipped in the rational and spiritual attributes of humanity; that he was *created* "very good," and at once assumed his indefeasible prerogative and dignity as made in the image of God, and lord of this lower creation, is the verdict alike of Scripture and of reason. Every form of the infidel assumption which makes man a transformed monkey, or a slowly tamed savage, is as gratuitous as it is degrading, and is spewed out of the mouth of genuine science.

ARTICLE II.—STOURDZA ON THE GREEK CHURCH.

[BY REV. A. N. ARNOLD, D. D., WESTBOROUGH, MASS.]

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.—The author of the following little treatise, Alexander de Stourdza, of Odessa, is one of the ablest, fairest, and most learned of the apologists for the Greek Church. The apology here translated was published at the close of the year 1848. Just twelve months before, there had been printed in the modern Greek tongue, and widely distributed among the Christians of the Eastern communion, an encyclical letter from Pius IX., inviting and exhorting them to return to the bosom of the Roman Church. This Papal document called forth a formal answer from the patriarchs and bishops of the Eastern Church, assembled in council. Many private individuals also published reviews and refutations of it. Of several such which we have examined, including the official one just referred to, the one here translated, with considerable abridgment, from the French original, is altogether the most temperate, scholarly, and impartial. It is, besides, more suitable for presentation in these pages, from the fact that it treats of the differences that distinguish the Greek Church from Protestantism, quite as fully as of those which separate that church from the Papal religion. Hence the title under which it was published, of "*The Double Parallel.*" In this respect, the translator supposed it might supply a want not infrequently felt by American scholars. The points of difference between the Oriental Church and the Reformed Churches of the West, he supposes not to be very generally and exactly understood. Nor are the sources of satisfactory information on the subject very readily accessible. It is hardly too much to say, that there is no surer authority on the questions here discussed, than Alexander de Stourdza. He has studied them long and thoroughly, and written upon them largely and ably. He states explicitly in the preface, that he offers this defence of Oriental Orthodoxy not merely to his Greek brethren, but to readers of all countries. It was for this reason, without doubt, that he wrote it in the French language.

Different persons will probably form different judgments as to the merits of this apology, and the weight of the author's arguments. To some, possibly, the reasoning, as a whole, may appear weak and puerile. To others it will probably appear plausible, and adapted, if not to convince Papists and Protestants of error, at least to re-assure and fortify the minds of adherents of the Greek Church who are exposed to hear its faith and rites attacked. If it should seem to any readers, that after all there is more to be said than they had supposed, in defence of certain doctrines and practices which they have always been used to regard as mere fables and superstitions, it may be that

neither truth nor charity would suffer any harm from such a conclusion. It is not likely that the naked presentation of the author's apology for the Greek Church, will make any converts from among the readers of the *Christian Review*.

It will be observed, that the phrase, "the Orthodox Church," is of frequent occurrence. This is the common designation of the Greek Church among her own members.

The question may naturally arise in the readers mind, why a literal translation was preferred to a condensed summary, in our own words. It would have been easy to have prepared such a summary; and it would have been more in accordance, perhaps, with the usage of such periodicals as this Review; but on the other hand, it seemed impossible to put our readers in a condition to appreciate the thoughts and feelings of an intelligent adherent of the Greek Church, so fairly and fully in any other way, as by giving them a faithful transcript of his sentiments and expressions, as well as of his arguments. The Greek Church is here allowed to peak for herself, and to plead her own cause.

This apology was originally published in a time of great civil commotions and revolutions on the European continent. It is presented to American readers at a time when our own political foundations are shaken as never before. The words with which the author concluded his preface then, are hardly less appropriate here and now. "At a time when the kingdoms of the earth are tottering and threatening to fall, it is both proper and profitable for the christian to turn his thoughts to that kingdom which is not of this world,—to raise his regards towards heaven at the moment when the earth trembles under his feet."

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE EASTERN AND WESTERN CHURCHES.

PART FIRST.

Picture to yourself a building, whose vast dimensions rise majestically from the ground, until it has reached an imposing height, according to the original plan of the architect; when lo! this massive structure changes its aspect, and divides into two separate buildings. The one preserves the same selection of materials, the same style, and the same ornaments as their common lease; the other, more sumptuous, differs essentially from the plan and proportions of the foundation. It is a beautiful and gorgeous structure, eclipsing by its magnificence the ancient and simple forms of the building beside it. It is deservedly admired: but the question to be decided is, which of the two buildings has remained conformed to the primitive plan? In order to decide this question,

compare these rival summits, then turn your eyes to the foundation, and your doubts will immediately vanish.

Such is the picture of the Eastern and Western Churches in the sixth century. To prove the fidelity of the similitude, it will be sufficient to compare them with each other, and with the lease, which is common to them both. The result of such a comparison cannot but be agreeable to sacred truth.

This is the method which we will now follow.

I. The Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit.

Our Lord, when he promised to his sorrowing disciples the supreme Comforter, described him in these words: "the Spirit of truth who proceedeth from the Father." The mission of the Spirit *in time* he attributes to himself; but in such a way as to intimate the *eternal procession* from the Father: "he whom *I will send unto you from the Father.*" But some one may say, after the resurrection the Saviour breathed on the disciples, and said, "receive ye the Holy Ghost," manifested by the power of binding and loosing. But let every one judge whether this act of the Divinity in time, and with reference to certain select persons, implies the eternal procession from the Son as well as from the Father.

The fathers of the second Ecumenical Council confined themselves to the literal statement of the doctrine; the subsequent councils formally prohibited any addition to the symbol of faith. In the year 809, just before the schism, Leo III., Bishop of Rome, caused the Greek and Latin text of the creed to be engraved on tables of silver, and exhibited them to the view of the faithful, with this inscription: "Haec Leo posui, amore et cautela orthodoxæ religionis." John VIII., a short time after, wrote to Photius, that he was not ignorant of the addition of "*filioque*," and that he disapproved of it; but that it was necessary to show indulgence to the weak. After these came the Popes Nicholas and Adrian, who spoke very differently. Their bad faith consummated the work which the ambition of both parties had commenced. All the West adopted the addition of "*filioque*;" the Orthodox Church rejects it, and maintains the symbol in its integrity. On which

side do we find conformity and fidelity to the teachings of the universal church, and of Jesus Christ its head?

II. *On the existence of Purgatory.*

The terms Purgatory and Purgatorial fire were unknown to Christian antiquity. As for the doctrine, the Orthodox Church of the East has always taught, since the time of Cyril of Alexandria, not any expiation for the dead, effected by pains and sufferings in Purgatory, but simply this, that *the prayers and alms of the living for the dead*, joined to faith in the merits of the Redeemer, and chiefly the oblation by the church of the *unbloody sacrifice*, can procure effectual succors for departed souls: in fine, that souls, after their departure from the body, have to pass through gradations, or successive stations (τελώνια) in ascending or descending to their eternal destination. This is all which the church has been able to infer from the divine revelations, which intimate that there are *degrees*, and various *abodes*, both in the place of blessedness and in the place of punishment. "In my Father's house," says our Lord, "there are *many mansions*." And he also speaks of an "*outer darkness*." The church prays, therefore, and commands us to pray, for the departed, but without venturing to sound the depths of the mercies of the Father through his well-beloved Son; without giving any vain encouragement to the curiosity of the spirit beyond the limits of express revelations.

We conclude from this, that our wise ignorance in regard to the pains and expiations of Purgatory is most conformed to the belief of the primitive church of the holy apostles and martyrs.

III. *On the Communion in both kinds.*

In instituting the Eucharist, our Lord, the High Priest and Spotless Victim, said expressly to his disciples, as he presented to them the cup of the new testament, "drink ye all of it." Now since the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ was instituted for a perpetual observance, even "until he come," and since our Savior has said, "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," the Eastern Church, faithful to primitive example,

has never dared to withhold the cup from the laity, nor even from infants of tender age. She ordains, moreover, that the bread shall be drenched in the consecrated wine.* The church of the West, on the other hand, has come at last to adopt that arbitrary distinction between the communion of priests and of the laity. She cannot justify such an innovation, either by the word of God, or by the universal tradition of the church: she cannot justify it by alleging such vain subtleties as this, that *a body cannot be destitute of blood*. And now, forsooth, will the church of the West, after having allowed the *abuse* in question to exist for centuries, try to prop itself up by the authority of the Council of Trent? But this will be to *bear witness to itself*, a witness which our Lord has declared null.

Here, then, is another point in dispute, which is settled at once by a simple comparison with the sacred usages of the universal church. (See Bossuet's History of Variations, and Flenry's History of the Church, on the Communion of Infants in primitive times.)

IV. On Immersion and Triple Immersion in Baptism.

In order to decide which party is in this case faithfully conformed to the divine word and to the holy traditions, it will suffice to read carefully that part of the Epistle to the Romans (vi: 4) which forms in our church a part of the baptismal service, and to appeal to the testimony in favor of the triple immersion in this initiatory rite, namely, the canons of the Second Ecumenical Council, and of that of Trullus, and the express words of Athanasius, of Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Catechetical Lectures, and lastly of John of Damascus. We, who follow with docility such examples and such precepts, are we not safe? The primitive plan of the building, which is not from the hand of man, speaks loudly in our favor. Cyril describes fully the ceremonies of baptism, and they are just those which we observe; Athanasius says in plain words, "we plunge the child into the water, and take it out, three

* In administering the Communion, the Greeks give to the communicant the bread, sodden in the wine, from the cup, with a spoon. (Tr.)

times, proclaiming thus the burial of our Lord, and his resurrection on the third day." Consult also the works of Theodoret, and a multitude of other passages in the writings of the fathers.

As for the sacrament of confirmation, or Holy Chrism, which our church administers immediately after baptism, there is the same agreement on our part with the church universal. It is well known that confirmation is nothing but a modification of the imposition of hands. Now the Apostles and their immediate successors conferred this last in regular course on the newly baptized. Consider, moreover, that in the view of all churches it is necessary to be confirmed in order to partake of the Eucharist. By not confirming children until the age of fourteen years, the churches of the West have condemned an immense majority of the human race to die before they have tasted of the bread of life! They may accumulate the most specious arguments in favor of this practice, but these arguments will never be able to stand before the right and simple faith, before the authority of the universal church of all times. Let them beware! by reasoning in this way, they will by little come at last to *allow only the baptism of adults*, after the example of some obscure sects of modern times.

V. On the use of Leavened or Unleavened Bread in the Communion.

On this disputed point, which consummated the separation of the two portions of Christendom, learning may supply a series of arguments for and against the opposing rituals. The one party will tell you that bread without leaven better represents the lamb without spot, offered up for the sins of the world; the other will reply, supporting their position by texts from the Gospel, that leaven is not always an emblem of impurity and hypocrisy, that it is also made to represent the *principle of salvation*. (As in the parable of the woman who kneaded the three measures of meal.) The Western Christians allege in favor of unleavened bread the rite of the Jewish passover, which excluded all leaven, and they hence infer that the Holy Supper was celebrated in the same manner;

the Eastern Christians oppose to this argument the original day of the mystical Supper, and the literal sense of the Greek word *ἄρτος*, which signifies leavened bread. They can appeal, moreover, to the *agapæ* of the primitive church, which were celebrated in any place, at any hour, without any preparation, with the bread and the wine which Providence furnished to the faithful. In this way the controversy may be indefinitely prolonged. But that which cuts it short at once is, that the use of leavened bread in the Sacrament is conformed to the constant tradition of the churches, which have had especially at heart to modify the Jewish usages, even to the extent of forbidding fasting and kneeling on Saturday and on the Lord's Day; and finally that the use of unleavened bread is very recent, even in the West. Behold once more, on the one part *disagreement*, on the other *conformity*.

VI. Definition of the Primacy of the See of Rome.

Our brethren of the West have adopted as their rule of conduct, to make large concessions in the controversy on all the disputed points, provided we will explicitly recognize that which they entitle *the doctrine*, namely, *the supremacy*, or *supreme spiritual sovereignty of the See of Rome* over all churches,—a sovereignty which they designate under the name of *the centre of Catholic unity*, and the *earthly vicariate* of our Lord Jesus Christ. Now observe in the outset, that the term earthly vicariate belies itself by its novelty. The same may be said of the epithets *infallible*, *indefectible*, which the Christian church never used and never knew for eight centuries; for it was not until the ninth that the Popes of Rome began openly to arrogate to themselves the right of absolute supremacy in *temporal matters*; and that even now they contest with the Gallican Church the principle, by virtue of which the latter has maintained that Ecumenical Councils are superior to the Bishops of Rome, and may depose them. Judge from this of the foundation of that *infallible*, but elastic power.

But what are the rank and the power of this eminent See founded by the Apostles Peter and Paul, and what primacy must we recognize in it? That which the universal church

has assigned to it. She has *decreed* to the See of Rome, not any *sovereignty*, but only a *primacy of rank and honor*. On this point read the plain and formal language (1) of the Acts of the First Ecumenical Council, Canon vi.; (2) of the Acts of the Second Ecumenical Council, Canon iii.; (3) of the Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, Canon viii.; (4) of the Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, Canon xxviii. The reading of these will prove to you that the primitive Church believed she had the right to assign their respective places to the Apostolic Sees; that she granted the *priority*, the *seniority*, τὰ πρεσβεΐα, to the See of Rome, in favor of the *imperial city*, and not at all by *divine right*; that she assigned the second rank to the Bishop of Constantinople for the same reason; that she made these decrees in regard to the order of the hierarchy *only in order to prevent usurpation*; that the Church universal did not recognize in the See of Rome any *sovereignty* over other churches, and did not quote in support of the *primacy* which she decreed to it any passage in the Gospel. Such is also the doctrine to which we adhere unalterably even to this day. Once more compare the diverse parts of the building, and give judgment.

The See of Rome cannot possess nor exercise more ample powers than those granted to Peter. To learn what these were, read the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Peter obeyed the existing powers; he had no patrimony here below; he presided with James in the Councils, without placing himself between them and our Lord Jesus Christ, in the dispensation of spiritual powers; he received and profited by the reproof of Paul; he did not pretend that other sees were such *by the grace of God and of his Apostolic See*, — an insulting formula, and so recent, that we must search for its origin in the middle ages. Peter, in fine, was content with being the *first* in the College of the Apostles, without assuming for himself any sovereignty over them, any infallibility inherent in himself alone. Descend with me the stream of time, and you will find that even down to Gregory the Great, and still later, the Bishops of Rome repudiated the title of *universal*, and kept themselves to their *legitimate primacy*; "*primus inter*

pares," first among their equals. But if the title of *Prince of the Apostles* applied to Peter, troubles you, remember that it is not found in any part of the New Testament. In fact the Gospel calls him the *first*, but it nowhere calls him *Prince*, in Greek, "*ἀρχων*," a name applied to the *Prince of darkness*, *ἀρχων τοῦ σκότους*, but never to any one of the Apostles. In this matter, it is only the Latin language which they pervert so cunningly: "*princeps apostolorum*" means only in Latin the *first* of the Apostles, just as "*editio princeps*" means the first edition. But we find in the Gospels two passages which seem to imply a universal supremacy accorded to Peter by our Lord. These are, (1) that where our Saviour rewards Peter for having confessed him without hesitation in these words: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," by replying to him, "and I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church;" and further on, "and I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and that which thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and that which thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Consult the Holy Fathers on the sense of that mooted passage; they will answer you, particularly Cyril, Epiphanius, and Augustine, that the rock is—Jesus Christ confessed aloud in faith; that the church, which is his body, can be founded only on him; that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven represent the power of binding and loosing, conferred elsewhere directly on all the Apostles, both before and after the resurrection of our Saviour; that oftentimes as the words addressed by Christ and Peter are addressed to him as the first among equals; and finally that the change of the name of Simon to Cephas or Peter indicates the regeneration of the old man in him, whereby his faith recognized in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, the man Christ, the God-man, the Son of the living God;—which is something that *flesh and blood* cannot reveal to us. So the Apocalypse teaches us that every man has a *name* different from that which he formerly bore; it shows us the City of God, founded on twelve stones representing the holy Apostles, *the chief corner-stone of Jesus Christ himself*. (2) The second passage which is cited in sup-

port of the earthly vicariate is that which contains the question and charge of the Lord addressed to Peter, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?—feed my lambs—feed my sheep." This question and charge, thrice repeated, in memory of the triple denial of Peter, manifestly only confirm his formal restoration to the apostolate. In decreeing the primacy to the See of Rome, the Church understood by it just what Cyril, Epiphanius, Cyprian, and Augustine understood. An *inherent infallibility in the chair of Peter*, the exclusive right of conferring the episcopate and of granting *indulgences*—these impieties, we say, are innovations of a date so recent that Christian antiquity has not even customary words to express them. Now no established idea, no real object, can subsist for eight or nine hundred years without a fixed name.

But before we close this prolonged parallel, whose conclusions are already evident, we must add one thing more. Our adversaries endeavor to dazzle the weak, by displaying proudly that which they call *catholicity*, a palpable sign, say they, of the true religion. We will not dispute the principle, provided it be remembered that this catholicity is *twofold* in its nature. *The catholicity of places* does not establish the truth of the doctrine, except in so far as it is found united with the *catholicity of times*: and here comes in that which we call *orthodoxy*. If it is not so, and if it is enough merely to *cipher* and *count* in order to discover the Catholic Church, what will you say of the epoch when Arianism had overrun the greater part of the Christian world? The *conformity* of the later constructions to the foundation which is common to them, is the only test by which we can discern the lesser deviations from the original plan conceived and sketched by the Author of our Salvation.*

In the midst of these lamentable controversies, let our watchword be, from age to age, always the same, *fidelity* and *charity*; fidelity, for he who shall endure to the end shall be

* Remember also that in Israel where every reality exhibited a type of the future, the kingdom of Israel comprised ten tribes, and that of Judah only two.

saved; charity and forbearance, for he who hateth or despiseth his brother cannot love God.

Let us examine ourselves first of all, according to the precept of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, to assure ourselves whether we are in the faith. For in default of that living faith which works by love, the most incontestable orthodoxy will only serve for our condemnation. When the false teachers reproach you with the pretended schism of the Eastern Church, and threaten you with your perdition, refer them, as a sufficient answer, to the Gospel, and to the constant tradition of the church, and pray sincerely for our calumniators.

If they persist, reply to them, that for more than a century after the lamentable misunderstandings between the Sees of Rome and of Constantinople, union was still maintained between the two portions of the patrimony of Jesus Christ. Tell them that two sisters, of whom one has preserved the will of their common father uncorrupted, the other has dared to alter and falsify it, remain nevertheless united by the ties of blood.

In our discussions with the heterodox, of whatsoever class, we ought to be modest, to distrust our own wisdom, and above all, never to confound *eternal religion* with *temporal civilization*. This last, the legitimate daughter of Christianity, in the progress which we see her making, ceases to be such when she goes astray. All her fruits do not proceed from one and the same sap. Her brilliant glory must not dazzle us, — it is not always the light which cometh from God. Civilization is extended by inches; religion cherishes and honors poverty; civilization coldly sacrifices individuals to the seeming prosperity of the masses; religion sees God in man and in nations; civilization thinks she owes nothing to barbarism and to ignorance; religion alone sits down lovingly under the nomad's tents, passes unremittingly from the cradle to the tomb, and from the poor man's hearth to the palace of kings. There are many civilizations; there is only one religion. Be not deceived then, when, in order to conceal the weak places in their cause, the ultramontanes complacently display to your view the picture of their power and their activity. When they

recount to you the good works of Martha, congratulate them; but point them at the same time to her sister Mary, motionless and unnoticed, at the feet of Jesus.

PART SECOND.

Statement of the Controversy between the Orthodox Church and the Reformation of the xvth Century.

The reaction of the great religious schism, though it began in the ixth century, did not make itself fully felt until the xvth. The See of Rome, left to itself and deprived of the wholesome check which Eastern Christianity had always put upon it, rushed on more and more eagerly in the ways of the world, and in the slippery path of the abuse of power. After having passed through the dark ages, the Papacy and the Western Church found themselves all at once, in the xvth century, in the presence of the awakened mind of Europe. The guardians of revealed religion had then no suspicion of the imminent danger with which they were threatened. In the successive attacks of Berengar, Wicliffe, John Huss, Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, and other reformed separatists, the clergy of the West did not recognize the formidable features of a just expiation. This expiation of the first schism and of the outrages perpetrated by the Crusades, in their merciless hatred of the Eastern Church, was to be suffered in the form of reprisals on the pride of an ecclesiastical power, which had always sacrificed every thing to its own ambition, not even excepting the primitive unity of the faith.

The religious reform of the xvth century attacked first the abuses of the See of Rome, but instead of taking for the point of departure and the standard of comparison, the doctrine, the institutions and the sacred rites of the universal Church, as these were preserved in the East, Luther, Calvin, and their adherents, constituted themselves *accusers and judges* in a question on which they should have appealed to the tribunal of sacred antiquity. Hence so many rash novelties on the one side, so much unyielding resistance on the other: the con-

troversy became a deadly duel; the lessons of apostolic times were forgotten or misread; and the only arbiter who could lawfully and naturally interpose in the quarrel (I mean the Greek Church, still neutral, and guarding faithfully her sacred deposit), was rejected by the combatants.

It was not until later, (towards the end of the xvth century), that the Protestant theologians of the University of Tübingen concluded to appeal to the testimony of the exiled and captive church, of that church which alone had the right to apply to itself the touching words of the great Apostle to King Agrippa, in the presence of the Roman Governor; "I would to God that you and all who hear me this day, were such as I am, except these bonds."

The letters of the theologians of Tübingen have come down to us, a monument of the sincerity of some of the learned doctors of the Reformation. The correspondence, begun on their part with the Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah II. (published at Leipzig in 1725), proves that among the Protestants of the xvth century there were some men of good faith, who felt the necessity of connecting themselves with the original stock of Christianity, and of seeking a point of support and stability in the bosom of that Church which had alone remained *catholic*, in its order, and in the uninterrupted continuance of time. But it was too late; and the pious attempt was but a partial movement. Jeremiah II. replied to the letters of the doctors of Tübingen, analyzing the confession of Augsburg, with equal thoroughness and moderation. Perhaps this venerable prelate did wrong in breaking off so suddenly, after several replies from his correspondents, an intercourse which they had been so tardy in commencing. We will not judge him; we only say, that from this time the silence and neutrality of the Eastern Church ceased; that the doctrine of the Reformation was rejected by her, in so far as that doctrine contradicted the teachings of the Ecumenical Councils and of sacred tradition; and that the more recent Councils of Jerusalem in 1648, and of Jassy in 1678, traced between the Catholic Greek Church and the Protestant Communions an unalterable line of separation, which we propose now to examine.

What are the articles of faith and of discipline which separate modern Protestantism from the Church founded by Jesus Christ and his Apostles? Reduced to their simplest and briefest expression, they are the following:

I. Faith and Good Works, regarded as indispensable conditions of our eternal salvation.

II. The Doctrine of the Eucharist.

III. The Doctrine of the Authority of the Church and of the Sacred Traditions.

IV. The Worship of Veneration due to the Holy Cross.

V. The Worship of the Holy Images, and of Holy Relics.

VI. The Religious Fasts appointed by the Church.

VII. The Doctrine of the State of Souls after death, and of Prayer for the Dead.

Such are the principal points in controversy. In examining them, we shall follow very nearly the same method which we pursued in our former Parallel between the Churches of the East and of the West. But for the benefit of those of our brethren and sisters in Christ, who desire to consult the original sources, and to understand the details of each question separately, we will refer to the documents. These are, first, the memorable Correspondence of the Faculty of Tübingen with the Patriarch Jeremiah II.; secondly, the Larger Catechism of Peter Moghila, Metropolitan of Kief, adopted and published in 1642; thirdly, the Confession of Faith, addressed by the Patriarchs of the East to the Holy Synod of Russia in 1721; lastly, the very valuable work of Stephen Yavorsky, Archbishop of Rezan, entitled, "The Rock of the Faith," an exhaustive treatise, which embraces all the points contested by the Reformers, and in which the most minute arguments which they urge against the doctrine of the church are reported in full, and answered and refuted one by one.

I. Faith and Good Works as conditions of eternal salvation.

At the period when Luther and his adherents entered upon their strife with the See of Rome, they were moved only by the enormity of the prevailing abuses. In fact, works of outward devotion were considered, in all the West, as essentially

meritorious; and the clergy, the only judges of the merit of these religious practices, had connected with them a multitude of *indulgencies* partial or plenary, by virtue of the powers conferred by the Papacy. This last preferred to employ, in a service of this doubtful nature, certain monastic orders, who were not subject to the authority of the Bishops. Hence resulted a disgraceful rivalry between the regular and the secular clergy, and between the different monastic fraternities. So the Reformers were led to attack works altogether, without even attempting to make any distinction in their nature; and they appealed exclusively to inward faith, of which no one can be judge. Imbued with the spirit of Augustine's controversial works against Pelagius, Luther undertook to revive his doctrine of efficacious grace; he declared the impotence of the free will of man, and proclaimed the principle of *salvation by faith alone*. Calvin deduced from this principle extreme consequences, maintaining a *predestination* by which salvation is secured to those who believe, by an *absolute decree*, without any regard to their good or bad actions. Observe, now, that all these propositions rest apparently on passages drawn from the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and the Romans. So great is the danger of an arbitrary interpretation of the word of God, without the aid of a legitimate authority and depositary of revealed truth. We are all saved by grace through faith, says the great Apostle of the Gentiles and this is strictly true; for he says elsewhere, "What hast thou that thou hast not received?" In the meanwhile the church, which embraces the *totality* of the truths necessary to salvation, teaches us: (1) That "without faith it is impossible to please God;" that there are three kinds of faith; *dead faith*, which of course cannot give *life*; the *faith of demons*, which leads only to terror and despair; "The devils themselves believe and tremble;" they know too much not to fear the things which they know not; finally, the "faith which works by love," πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη; and it is this which procures our eternal salvation: (3) that salvation is therefore in fact *gratuitous*, in this sense, that our *justification* before God is by the grace and the merits of our Lord Jesus

Christ. This purely gratuitous justification constitutes the *inheritance* of the Christian, and his *right*, as the adopted child of his Heavenly Father: (4) but where is the son who, if ungrateful and disobedient, cannot be disinherited? Justification is our *right*, but we may lose it by our own fault: eternal salvation is an *achievement* (*un fait*), and we are commanded to merit it.

See, then, why it is that in numberless passages of the Old and the New Testament, the eternal bliss of the elect is described, now under the name of an *inheritance*, and anon under the name of wages (*salaire*), in order that we might know that our *justification* is a free gift of grace, acquired by the merits of Jesus Christ; but that our salvation requires for its attainment the *income* [*usure*] of our *works*, and constitutes the superabundant *wages* granted by the Father of mercies to every worker who is obedient to the voice of his only and well-beloved Son, albeit he may have come in at the eleventh hour of the day.

To exalt the infinite mercy of God, at the expense of his justice, is not to give glory to Him. So our church, without descending to the subtleties of the modern school, has pronounced her final decision on this difficult subject, in the exposition of the articles of faith which we have named above. We cite the very words as they stand: "We believe that man is justified not only by faith, but by faith in so far as it works by love; or in other words, *by faith and works*. But that faith by itself, performing the office of a hand, takes hold on the righteousness which is in Christ, and applies it for our salvation, this we declare to be irreconcilable with true piety. We believe, on the contrary, that the faith which is in us justifies us before Christ by our works, and we regard the works not simply as evidences, but as real fruits, which vitalize faith, as meritorious in themselves, because of the divine promises which assure us that each one shall receive the reward (*prix*) of the deeds done in *in the body*, to wit, of *the good* or *the evil* which he has done." (Art. viii.)

Without doubt whoever dies suddenly, and immediately after having first exercised perfect faith, and received the gift of

divine grace, will be *saved*, without the concurrence of his good works. But does it follow from this, that those who live on after their conversion are freed from obligation to fulfil the commandments? Cornelius, the Centurion, was informed by an angel that his *prayers* and *his alms were come up to God*. Abraham, the father of the faithful, to whom faith, according to the word of God, was *imputed* for righteousness, was nevertheless proved by the command *to offer up to God his only son*: so inseparable is the work of sacrifice from the inward homage of faith. Accordingly Paul teaches us, that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

The Reformed doctors, addressing upright and humble souls, take advantage of them, extolling the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, as alone efficacious in procuring our salvation. No one disputes that; but the divine commands, sealed by his blood and voluntary passion, are not less efficacious, nor less sacred. "Whoso keepeth my commandments, he it is that loveth me." To love Jesus Christ is to practise good works, and so to attest a living faith in Him; but to blacken and debase good works, as the sectaries do, under the pretext of our *impurity*, is to disparage the merits and the virtue of the Sacrifice of eternal propitiation. The grace acquired by the Redeemer is not a simple garment of righteousness designed to cover our iniquities before God; it is a cloak impregnated with a healing balsam, which *covers*, it is true, the ulcer of our sins, but *cures* while it covers.

To sum up and conclude all that has been said, far from allowing ourselves to be misled by the false semblance of superior piety, we ought to adhere closely to the doctrine of *the necessity of true faith and of good works* in order to the attainment of eternal salvation: the *necessity of faith*, because, according to the word of the Author of salvation, *without Him we can do nothing*; and because *no flesh shall be justified before him* by the works of the law; finally, because it is still Jesus Christ who *works in us both to will and do, of his good pleasure*: the *necessity of works*, because it is written that we have been called of God to good works; and

because we believe, according to his word, that the Lord will disown, in the day of judgment, even those who have had such faith as to work miracles, unless they have kept his commandments; for He it is who will render to every one according to his works.

II. Of the Eucharist.

When we reflect carefully on the teachings, so often repeated, by which our Redeemer inculcated on the unteachable Jews the mystery of the celestial aliment contained in his flesh and His blood, given for the salvation of the world, we cannot fail to perceive a presentiment of the spiritual contests which the doctrine of the Eucharist would occasion in after times. Berengar, Abelard, Zwingle, and Calvin, in marshalling the ranks of their captious subtleties on the Sacrament of the altar, do they not seem to be echoing that seditious clamor of the ancient Jews: "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" In the mean time the first disciples of our Lord, faithful to his divine commands, and impressed with the truth of his word—"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you"—hastened to institute the divine Liturgy, or bloodless sacrifice of the Mass, in order that the Supper of the Lord might continue and be perpetual upon earth, even till his last and glorious coming. Whether we consult the text of the three Liturgies of Basil, Chrysostom, and Gregory the Theologian, or study the works of the Fathers of the church, we find everywhere a firm and unanimous belief in the *real presence* of the body and blood of the Saviour in the Sacrament. In vain have some sectaries, Calvin among the rest, wished to reduce it to a simple rite of commemoration. "This is my body; this is my blood;"—these words rebuke and confound their want of faith, just as of old, in the Garden of Gethsemane, those two simple words, ἐγώ εἰμι, "I am he," prostrated at once the satellites of the synagogue, with their arms and lighted torches. Luther himself was never willing to yield, on this point, to the faithless importunity of his own disciples, Carlstadt and Bucer. "This is too clear, too precise," writes the Reformer. But exasperated as he was against the Masses of the West, and the way

in which they were sometimes abused, Luther, in order to smite the priest, smote the Sacrament. He preserved the doctrine of the *real presence*, making it to depend entirely *on the faith* of those who communicate, and without admitting the mysterious act of the *transubstantiation* of the consecrated elements, by virtue of the sacramental words, and of the invocation of the Holy Spirit. Now this theory is false and arbitrary. By an inseparable connection of errors, Luther destroyed at the same blow the Sacrament of Penitence, although in his catechism he still exhorts the faithful to confess occasionally. Vain attempt! No one regards his counsel! For he himself had instructed his disciples that individual faith takes the place of everything. It is this which causes the *reality* of the sacred mysteries; it is this still, according to his doctrine, which blots out our sins, without the concurrence of any priestly authority instituted by the Holy Spirit.

III. The Doctrine of the Authority of the Church, and of the Sacred Traditions.

Revealed religion is not merely a *religious sentiment*; neither is it a simple *science* of divine things. Religion is both these; but it is, moreover, a *law*, designed to regulate our thoughts and our actions. Hence the necessity of a *church*, or society of the faithful, obedient to the same precepts, guided by one legitimate authority, and entrusted with the deposit of faith, morals, and the sacred traditions, whether transmitted orally or in writing. In order to nourish in us the *religious sentiment*, it would have sufficed to propagate an *opinion*. In order to cultivate the *science* of divine things, it would only have been necessary to found a *school*. But in order to establish a *supreme law* for intelligent beings, there was need of a *church*; and accordingly Jesus Christ laid the foundations of a church on earth. The word church signifies, etymologically, an *assembly called out*. In fact every believer is called out from this world, in order to become a member of a kingdom which, though *in* this world, is not of this world. Jesus foretold to his disciples persecution and martyrdom. But at the same time he commanded them to obey the church ("he that despiseth you despiseth me"); and to have recourse to

it in their differences (Matt. xviii: 17). In his sacerdotal prayer, before his passion, he prayed for those who should believe on him, through the word of the apostles and others; he promised his divine presence in the midst of those who should meet together in his name. Paul defines the church in these words: "the pillar and ground of the truth."

Luther, Calvin, and their adherents, knew all this. But it was their interest to break the sceptre of the Papacy, even at the risk of trampling under foot the promises and the express precepts of the Lord. Accordingly they began, not by denying the authority of the church, but by assigning to that authority arbitrary limits of time. The symbolical books of the Reformation extolled this authority, as a rule of faith, from the time of the apostles down to the Fourth Ecumenical Council. Such was their religious *eclecticism*. Now *eclecticism*, in a matter of faith, is a synonym of heresy*.

The successors of Luther, following his example, but not imitating his moderation, appealed exclusively to the Bible from every decision of the universal church. And aware that the Bible requires to be interpreted and applied to the needs of man, the sectaries denied to the church this right of authorized interpretation in order to give it up to the *individual judgment*. From that moment the inundation of false doctrines broke through all barriers. In our days they have gone further; the most celebrated doctors of the Reformed church openly appeal from the Holy Bible to the tribunal of *human reason*. It is thus that the church, as a divine institution, has ceased to exist in the bosom of Protestantism. It has ceased to exist there, notwithstanding some forms and semblances of life, because, (1) the right to interpret the Holy Scriptures and maintain pure doctrine is given up to individual judgment; (2) the right of binding and loosing sins is denied to it, and also that of consecrating the elements of bread and wine in the Eucharist; (3) the Episcopate and the priesthood, despoiled of all their prerogatives, have been reduced to a simple office of preaching; (4) the seven sacraments, appointed

* In Greek, *αἰρέω* and *ἐκλέγω* are synonymous.

to produce and to support spiritual life among Christians, have been arbitrarily reduced to *two*. All the seven sacraments rest on express texts of Scripture, and on the constant tradition of all ages of the Christian era. Moreover, if the spiritual life of every Christian has need of Baptism to *originate* it, of the Eucharist to *nourish* it, and of Confirmation to *increase* and strengthen it in us, it has need no less of Penitence, to *heal* its infirmities and purify its pollutions; of the sacrament of Marriage, to *perpetuate* it in a holy manner, and to transmit the divine promises; of the *Unction of the sick* to *re-establish* the action of the soul upon the body; and finally of sacred Ordination, since every *work* here below, though divine, has need of *workers* to perform it.

But this is not all: from the first century of the Christian era, there were in the Christian world apocryphal gospels that is to say, gospels that were neither inspired nor authentic. Who taught us to distinguish them? By what authority has the Christian church recognized and preserved only *four* Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, a limited number of their Epistles, and the Apocalypse of John? It is sacred tradition, kept alive in the apostolic sees, which alone can separate the dross from the pure gold: it is this which, traversing the darkness of time and the course of ages, warrants to us the integrity of the divine code of the New Testament, defined, at a later date, by the Canons of the Councils. The Apostle Paul praises the Thessalonians for their fidelity in preserving his instructions, whether by *word* or by *writing*. Elsewhere he exhorts the Christians of his time to preserve the traditions, saying, "Stand fast, and hold the traditions," placing them on a level with the Holy Scriptures [2d Thess., ii: 15]. But the leaders of the Reformation say to us: "Be ye rebellious, and despise the traditions." We must therefore choose between the Apostle of the Gentiles, and the Reformers of the xvth century. Without doubt there are false traditions: it is these which our Lord explicitly reprov'd in speaking to the Scribes and Pharisees. But if there are such spurious traditions, which are "mere commandments of men," is there not so much the more need that we be referred to the authority of the church, and to her constant testimony?

Christianity has need of a church composed of those who govern and those who obey; she has need, in order to furnish a legitimate vehicle for the written word, of a uniform and constant tradition, entrusted to the church, in order that the *mysteries* of divine revelation, and its salutary precepts contained in the Bible, may not become a *dead letter*, or rather a *deadly* letter to those who shall attempt to interpret them in the wantonness of their prejudices and their prepossessions.

IV. On the Worship of Veneration due to the Holy Cross, to the Most Holy Virgin Mary, Mother of God, to the Angels, and to the Saints.

The prophet Isaiah saw the Lord long ago, in the Spirit, and represented Him as going to his propitiatory sufferings, *with the sign of dominion upon his shoulder*; οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁμοῦ αὐτοῦ [ch. ix: 6, 7]. This sign is the Holy Cross, on which Jesus Christ accomplished, by his voluntary death, the work of our redemption. On this account the Christian church of the first centuries thought that a certain worship [culte] ought to be paid to this glorious sign, in the first place, as an instrument of salvation, and a symbol of the most profound mysteries of the inward life; in the second place, after the true cross was discovered by the Empress Helena, as an earthly throne of the Lamb of God, immolated for the sins of the world; an humble throne, stained with the blood of Jesus, and consecrated by the touch of his flesh. If the hem of our Lord's garment healed the sick who touched it in faith; if his spittle restored sight to one born blind; what can be more lawful than the worship of veneration paid to his cross, whatever be the material of which it is formed? We see in Cyril of Alexandria, and in John Chrysostom, that they had received the tradition to honor the Holy Cross, and to employ it as a shield against the temptations of evil spirits. Chrysostom, the eagle of Antioch, the most faithful disciple of Paul, with his powerful and persuasive eloquence, recommended to the Christians of his time to mark with the sign of the cross their habitations, their couches, their repasts, the streets and gates of their cities, to make this sign on their foreheads and their breasts as well as to engrave it on their in most hearts. After

such testimonies, what shall we say of the rage of the sectaries of the xvith century against the sign of the cross. They charge this worship with the guilt of idolatry; they carry their madness so far, as even to substitute, on the summits of their temples, instead of the *cross*, the *cock*, the rebuker of Apostle Peter's weakness. Even to this hour, they continue to regard with pity the Christians who adopt the sign of the cross as the visible seal of *Christian* prayer, and who have faith in the efficacy of this sign. Infancy and youth no longer enjoy, in protestant countries, this peaceful safeguard of innocence, this last prayer of the man whose lips are mute, and whose heart is chilled by the near approach of death.

In venerating the cross of our Divine Master, the orthodox Christian does not adore the *material*, any more than Moses, Aaron, and all the children of Israel, when they presented themselves before the Ark of the Covenant, adored the wood, the gold, and the purple, which had been used in its construction.

In fine, the holy and venerable cross is the very same glorious sign which Moses, in the book of Deuteronomy [ch. xxix.], foretold to the rebellious Jews, as destined to meet their views incessantly, during their universal dispersion: "and ye shall have your life constantly suspended before your eyes" [v. 66].* Is it then in order to falsify the predictions of the legislator of the Hebrews, that the innovators of the xvith century persist in withdrawing from the view of the faithful the august symbol of their salvation? — that salutary and yet terrible sign of the Son of Man, which, according to the Gospel, shall be seen in heaven at the last day.

We pass now to consider the worship of veneration which is due to the Most Holy Virgin Mary. This worship is only the fulfilment of the prophecy of the mother of the Lord: "for behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed."

Observe in the first place that this injunction of the church teaches us an important and consoling truth, namely, that the church militant on earth, and the church triumphant in

* Where our version reads, "Thy life shall hang in doubt before thee," the Septuagint has, *ἔσται ἡ ζωὴ σου κρεμαμένη σοι ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου* (Tr).

heaven, are closely joined, and communicate with each other by *prayer* and by the sacrament of the altar. There is an intimate and mysterious interchange of benefits between these two churches; the one sends up to heaven the incense of prayer; the other sends down upon us the dew of grace. In accordance with this, the Gospel declares to us, that "there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety-and-nine just persons who need no repentance." Vain is the objection to the invocation of the Virgin, the Angels, and the Saints, that they are not everywhere present, as God is. They see, hear, and receive our prayers, by a dispensation of divine light, it matters not how. For the prophet-king exclaims: "in thy light we shall see light." Do you wish for more explicit testimonies? Call to mind the sweet words of the Apostle Peter to his disciples, a little before his martyrdom, "I know that I shall shortly put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me. I will endeavor that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance." The Apostle does not withdraw himself from his converts. He is certain of that angelic ministry, which is common to saints and to angels. These last, as Paul expressly teaches us, are so many "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." Moses shows them to us, even in his time, as appointed guardians of various regions and nations.* In fine, our Lord teaches us that the souls of children are especially entrusted to their care. "Take heed," he says, "that ye despise not one of these little ones; for verily I say unto you their angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." If such is then the intimate and perpetual correlation of the two churches, if the Most Holy Mother of the Lord is the most excellent of creatures, first on account of her election, then on account of her retired life on earth, and finally on account of the double privilege of her virginity and her ineffable maternity, what can be more lawful and beneficial than to invoke her intercession?

* In Deut. xxxii: 8, the last clause reads in the Septuagint, "according to the number of the angels of God," κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ.

But our opponents object that Paul explicitly declares to us that there is but "one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." According to this text, is it not wrong to have recourse to other intercessors? Yes, it would be as they say, if the Apostle stopped there; but they mutilate the passage. Here it is in its completeness; "there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." This is what the Apostle teaches us; and far be it from us to take away anything from what the Holy Spirit has revealed to us by his mouth. We confess with Paul one only Mediator between God and men who gave himself a ransom for all. But we know that our Saviour's being the only Mediator who gave himself a ransom for all, does not exclude the intercession in our behalf of the Holy Virgin, of the Angels, of the Saints and Martyrs, who have walked here below in his footsteps, and who help us by their prayers to climb the steep path to our eternal mansion. "God is glorious in his saints,"* exclaims the prophet-king; and Paul, who was rapt even to the third heaven, teaches us, that we "are no more strangers and pilgrims, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God."

But if causeless and culpable subtleties interpose, in the case of our brethren, between earth and heaven; if they will not allow themselves to invoke the aid of the prayers of perfected saints, although they have no scruple in recommending themselves to the prayers of sinners here below; if the four-and-twenty elders before the throne of the Lamb reveal nothing to them concerning the mystery of the intercession of martyrs and just ones; let them reserve, alas! the tribute of their homage for heroes of flesh and blood, but let them leave us to honor without molestation this radiant cloud of apostles, confessors, martyrs, and ascetics, "of whom," says Paul, "the world was not worthy."

* The author probably attributes to David, by mistake, the words of Moses, "God is—glorious in holiness," (Exod. xv: 11,) which are rendered in the Septuagint, *θεδοξασμενος ἐν ἁγίοις*. (Tr.)

V.—*On the Worship of Veneration paid to the Holy Images and the Holy Relics.*

Consult the whole series of the Confessions of Faith and the Catechisms of the Orthodox Church our Mother, from John of Damascus, down to Peter of Moghila, and even to our own days, that is to say, through a period of eleven or twelve centuries; open the Acts and the Canons of the Seventh Ecumenical Council held at Nice, against the Iconoclasts; and you will find on every page proofs of the most watchful care to define justly the devotion paid to the Holy Images and the Relics of the Saints, and to remove from it every trace of superstitious worship.

Everywhere the church has established the principle that *the honor rendered to the image redounds to the archetype*, to the original which it represents. It is not then the gold, nor the colors, nor the wood, nor the stone, which the Orthodox Christian venerates in the Images.

In vain do our detractors attempt to confound the commandments of the law of Sinai with the absurd inconsistencies of the Iconoclasts and the Mahometans. The second precept of the Decalogue forbids the making and the adoring of any *likeness* of things which are in heaven (the visible heaven), upon the earth, or under the waters. Nevertheless, God directed Moses to make the Tabernacle and the Ark of the Covenant, adding: "thou shalt make all these things after the pattern which was shown to thee in the mount." When the children of Israel were perishing by thousands from the bite of the serpents in the wilderness, God commanded Moses to set up, in the midst of the camp, a serpent of brass; and all who looked upon that were cured. Now the brazen serpent represented the son of man, according to the express testimony of our Lord. The ark was overshadowed by *two figures of Cherubim*; and what settles the question at once is, that the Holy Scripture teaches us in plain and express terms that Moses and Aaron, when they came, on behalf of the people, prostrated themselves before the tabernacle. (Numb. xx: 6.) Now one of these three things follows: either the whole people of Israel, with their legislator at their head, did not under-

stand the second commandment ; or the word of God contradicts itself; or, else, we must admit and acknowledge, that the worship of veneration offered by us to the sensible images of divine objects, with reference to those objects which they represent, is perfectly agreeable to the will of God. If it has been abused, the *abuse* does not destroy the *use*, "*abusus non tollit usum.*" On the contrary, it is the contempt of the images and the symbols consecrated by grace, which leads to error and sacrilege. So Uzzah was punished with death, for having rashly touched the Holy Ark; and the Israelites were cured by gazing with faith on the brazen serpent. Yet neither the wood of the Ark, nor the metal of the brazen serpent, were in themselves powerful, or worthy of adoration.

What shall we say, or what shall we think, after such a collection of testimonies, after such proofs derived from Revelation and from the Canons of the Church; what shall we say, alas! of that famous Theodore Beza, who in the Colloquy of Montpelier wrote: "nothing displeases me so much as the sight of a picture representing Jesus Christ!" How happy are we, poor sinners as we are; and where should we have been, if the Son of God had felt the same dislike of the human form!

We pass now to the worship of veneration, which we render to the Holy Relics.

The first Christians, in building their temples and holding their assemblies, gave the preference to places consecrated by the burial of martyrs. They honored then these dear remains, destined one day to "shine as the sun in the kingdom of the Father;" they had faith in the virtue of the Holy Relics, and they built their altars above them. They imitated in this respect the contemporaries of the Apostles, who, in their maladies vied with each other for the *clothes* of Paul (Acts xix: 12); and they believed in that all-powerful grace, which, a little earlier, had communicated to the *shadow* of Peter the power to heal the sick that were laid in his path (v: 15). Moreover, examples authorizing devotion to the Holy Relics abound in the Holy Scriptures, as do also proofs of the beneficent and healing virtue which God has been pleased to grant to them. The Israelites, when going out of Egypt under the

conduct of Moses, took care to bring religiously along with them the bones of Joseph. We read in the Second Book of Kings, that a dead man, whose corpse touched the lifeless remains of the prophet Elisha, was restored to life. In the same Book of Kings we read that at the time when the pious king Josiah was exterminating idolatry, and overthrowing the temples of the idols, he caused many dead bodies to be burned; but at the same time he enjoined the preservation with religious care and honor, of the body of a prophet, a man of God, found among the ruins.

We have also testimonies from the Canons of the Church, from the teachings of the Holy Fathers, and from all Christian antiquity, to confirm the Orthodox doctrine in regard to the veneration and virtue of the Holy Relics. The Council of Gungra, which immediately followed the First Ecumenical Council of Nice, and whose authority is acknowledged in the church, in its Ninth Canon, expressly condemns those who dislike and despise the holy places where the sacred remains of the martyrs repose. The Seventh Ecumenical Council is explicit in its decisions respecting the veneration of the Holy Relics. It calls them "sources of healing, by means of which God deigns to dispense to men a multitude of benefits." It ordains *the deposition of those ministers who refuse due honor to the relics of the saints*. It determines that such relics shall be placed in the churches which may have been consecrated without this essential qualification. In support of these august decrees of the universal church, and as a complement to them, we have innumerable testimonies of the greatest Fathers,—testimonies which we have not room here to cite. We merely mention Basil the Great, Cyril of Jerusalem, the two Gregories, Chrysostom and Ambrose. It would be superfluous to add to these the clear proofs contained in the work of John, of Damascus, entitled "*Exposition of the Faith*."

VI.—*Of the Religious Fasts instituted by the Church.*

As to the obligation of fasting in general, so plainly sanctioned in the Gospel, there is no dispute between the church and her adversaries. But they differ with us in regard to the

application of the fundamental precept. Now the fasting of the Christian involves three elements, the *time*, the *quantity*, and the *quality*.

It would be absurd to deny to our Mother, the Church, the right to determine the times of abstinence. For the Apostle recommends us to do all things in a spirit of charity, and it is just this charity which requires that we should rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep and fast with those who weep and fast. The church in her wisdom has therefore established four fasts in the year, without reckoning the Wednesdays and Fridays of each week, and certain vigils. She has always regarded fasting and abstinence simply as *means of improvement*, and not as *works meritorious in themselves*. The proof of this is seen in the fact that during the course of Lent she incessantly repeats to us the sweet and sublime words of the prophet Isaiah concerning the spiritual fast. Nor is this all: the Church prescribes entire fasting to those who partake of the Holy Communion.

But remembering that the majority of Christians subsist by *labor*, remembering that the need of nourishment varies indefinitely, according to the diversity of age, sex, temperament, vigor of constitution, and the accidental circumstances of life, the Church has not been able to give a common rule for all, nor to reduce to a uniform measure the quantity of nourishment during the times of abstinence or of Lent.

It was necessary to define the quality. To this end the Holy Fathers pointed out the *least substantial kinds* of food, and the least savory, as a guaranty of moderation. The Church has never established any essential distinction as inherent in the quality of meats; she has done nothing which conflicts, on this point, with the precepts of the Saviour and the Apostle of the Gentiles. She knows better than we, that it is not that which enters in by the mouth which defiles a man. But the grace from on high has revealed to her the mighty influence of different kinds of food on the health of the body, and through that on the health of our souls.

Such are the simple and evident arguments in favor of fixed times of abstinence, and of the choice between different kinds of food.

VII.—*On the State of the Souls of the Blessed after Death and on Prayer for the Dead.*

This pious institution of the true Church rests on the same principle as the invocation of Saints. It cements the mystic and ineffable union of the Church militant on earth, and that which is triumphant in heaven. The two, having for their Head Jesus Christ, the Supreme Mediator between God and men, ought by all means, for the salvation of souls, to remain in perpetual contact. This mutual and spiritual contact is *prayer*, on the basis of the reconciliation wrought by the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus crucified for us. Even until the day of his glorious advent and of his final judgment, the just who have gone before us do not yet enjoy the fulness of their reward; the sinful souls have not received the full measure of that punishment which they have brought upon themselves. And *this is so ordered*, according to the testimony of Paul, *on purpose that they might not be made perfect without us.* [Heb. xi: 40.]

The practice of praying for the dead dates back farther than the Christian era. [The author here quotes and comments on II. Maccabees xii: 42–45; Tobit iv: 17; and Ecclesiasticus vii: 33. The Greek Church, like the Latin, receives these apocryphal books as parts of inspired Scripture.] The First Book of Kings, and the prophecies of Jeremiah, teach us that it was customary to fast in memory of the dead, after their funerals, as was done in the case of Saul, and that this commemoration was altogether omitted after the death of those who had incurred final reprobation, according to the commandment of God to the prophet.

Under the law of grace, also, the Evangelist John declares to us, that there are *mortal* sins, and others which are *not mortal*. He recommends prayer for the remission of these last, which may have been committed by our brethren. On the basis of this precept of charity and of faith, the church prays without ceasing, and offers the divine Eucharist, for the sins of all her dead children, excepting those who have departed this life in a state of final impenitence.

Finally, to set the seal upon this collection of proofs, we

cite here the very words of our Lord Jesus Christ, "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." From this declaration the most learned interpreters draw this legitimate conclusion, that certain sins are remitted in the future world. It is also in this sense that in the Gospel of Luke he exhorts us to "make to ourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when we fail they may receive us into everlasting habitations." And this is just what Zaccheus the publican did, under the prompting of faith and repentance.

The following truths will be sufficient to demonstrate the efficacy of the prayers of the church, of the oblation of the Holy Sacrifice, and of alms, in behalf of the dead.

1. Every mortal sin, that is to say, every free and premeditated violation of the divine law, which has not been washed out by faith and repentance, brings upon the transgressor the penalty of eternal reprobation, and of temporal chastisements. Sin bears this two-fold fruit.

2. Every believing and penitent sinner obtains remission of the eternal penalty, by the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ. But in finding grace for his soul, the transgressor is not absolved thereby from the direct and temporal consequences of his sin, such as, shame, affliction, sickness, the proceedings of human justice, and natural death: these he undergoes here below justly and inevitable.

3. We see every day a great number of sinners, our brethren, dying with penitence indeed, but before they have undergone the temporal penalty of their transgressions here below. In order to supply this deficiency, and to confirm repentant souls in their penitence, the church imposes on them pious exercises, voluntary privations, which are designated by the name of *canonical penalties*. Now when christians die before they have undergone these, or suddenly and without efficacious preparation, although in a state of grace, it is for them that the maternal solicitude of the church has instituted unceasing prayers and commemorations, whose efficacy and sweet odor

are derived from the unbloody sacrifice of the mass. She implores, on behalf of these souls in peril, the mercy of the Father, through the grace of the Son, and the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. Nothing short of certain signs of final impenitence, according to the precept of the Apostle John already referred to, imposes silence on the distressful cry of her maternal heart.

4. The universal church, on the grounds here set forth, has always ordered liturgies and prayers for the repose of the souls of her children. We say always; for the three liturgies of James, Basil, and Chrysostom, contain, in their respective rituals, each three prayers for the dead.

5. Besides the prayers which each believer asks of the church for his deceased neighbors, our common mother has established certain days of universal commemoration for all the dead. It is on these occasions that her ingenious charity enumerates, in affecting supplications, all the forms of death, all the calamities and all the sufferings, to which man the sinner is exposed here below. She implores for these countless sufferers the compassion of God our Saviour.

6. Remembering that the fathers of the church, and especially Cyril of Alexandria and John of Damascus, have taught that the souls of the dead, immediately after their decease, have to pass through certain stations, or gradations, under the guidance of their guardian angels, and in the presence of mischievous spirits, who take advantage of our defilements to obstruct our ascending progress towards the mansions of rest, the church has ordained that the most fervent prayers should be multiplied for the assistance of her deceased children, during the space of forty days from their separation from their bodies. Such, in the economy of the figures and shadows of the ancient law, was the desert which lay between Egypt, the emblem of this world, and the land of promise, the image of heaven.

To recapitulate; the substance of the doctrine defined above rests on a series of explicit texts drawn from the Holy Scriptures, on the universal and constant tradition of the church, on the decrees of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, on the teach-

ings of numerous fathers, and finally on the principle of intimate and necessary cohesion between the church militant on earth, and the church triumphant in heaven. The cement which unites them, under their sole and common Head, our Lord Jesus Christ, is composed of the two salutary elements, the Invocation of the Saints, and Prayer for the Dead.

The reformers of the xvith century, having rejected the first as *idolatrous*, saw themselves under the necessity of abolishing the last as *useless* and *superstitious*. They wished to substitute for the doctrine of Purgatory taught by the Latin Church, a more modern doctrine, which the ancient fathers never taught.

According to the maxims of the Orthodox Church, there is nothing here of expiation in purgatory, nothing of *merits* or *demerits* after death, but only and simply a maternal aspiration of prayer and oblations on the part of the church in behalf of the dead, and with a view to their obtaining the free remission of the temporal penalties which they have incurred, while their *eternal destiny* is not yet irrevocably fixed by the Sovereign Judge.

As for the moral effects of prayer for the dead, we will not dwell upon them: they recommend themselves to every mind free from prejudice, to all hearts that are full of love and strong in faith. Besides, this pious observance is marked with a double seal, of truth and of charity. The one is inseparable from the other, just as there is vital *heat* wherever the true *light* shines.

Having thus briefly passed in review the seven principal points which separate our holy communion from all the recent novelties introduced by the reformation of the xvith century, we hasten to lay aside the pen. We leave all with God: we guard our sacred deposit, without any mixture of bitterness toward those who dare to oppose the Holy Church, or the Holy Gospel. They are imposed upon by the false semblance of doctrinal purity; they confound the *thing itself* with its *abuse*; they open, alas! a wide door for the intrusion of haughty human reason into the humble domain of christian faith.

THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST AS ATTESTED BY THE EVANGELISTS.

[BY A. HOVEY, D. D., OF NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.]

By a miracle we mean an event which, according to the principles of sound reasoning, may and must be referred to the extraordinary agency of God. No event, therefore, which evidently disagrees with the moral character of God; no event which can be reasonably traced to angelic, demoniac, or human action; no event which may be fairly ascribed to the working of natural laws or forces, is a miracle; but an event which, in view of its character and circumstances, can rationally be referred to extraordinary divine action, and to that alone, as its cause, is properly miraculous. By saying, "to that alone," we do not mean to exclude the co-operation of natural forces in producing such an event, but rather to affirm that such forces, if used, are directed and re-enforced by extraordinary divine action, which superior action determines the event*

As, however, the occurrence of such an event has been pronounced to be to the last degree improbable, and, indeed, morally impossible, we shall notice briefly the grounds of such a judgment, before examining the testimony for the miracles

*Hugh Farmer, in his *Essay on the Demoniacs of the N. T.*, says, "A miracle is an effect produced in the system of nature, contrary to the general rules by which it is governed; Tillotson, *Sermon on Miracles*, vol. ix, p. 352, says, "It is a supernatural effect, evident and wonderful to sense;" Wardlaw, on *Miracles*, defines it to be "a work involving a temporary suspension of the known laws of nature;" Alexander, "A visible suspension of the laws of nature;" Mansel, "An interposition of divine power;" Bayne, "An occasional display of divine power, independently of those sequences of natural law through which God commonly acts."

of Christ ; for the result of our examination of this testimony will be affected more or less by our opinion as to the antecedent probability of miracles. If we are satisfied of their being "to the last degree improbable," we shall yield but a reluctant assent to the fullest proof of their reality; but if we find them to be in certain circumstances "not improbable," a less amount of evidence will be convincing. We shall, therefore, at this point review the principal arguments in favor of rejecting all testimony for miracles — stating these arguments, for the sake of brevity, in our own words, and in the simplest manner possible.

I. Many alleged miracles are known to be spurious, and therefore it is safe to infer that all are spurious. Says David Hume : "The many instances of forged miracles and prophecies and supernatural events, which in all ages have either been detected by contrary evidence, or which detect themselves by their absurdity, prove sufficiently the strong propensity of mankind to the extraordinary and marvelous, and ought reasonably to beget a suspicion against all relations of this kind." And so frequently, he declares, have miracles been forged in support of "popular religions," that "we may establish it as a maxim, that no human testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle, and make it a just foundation for any such system of religion."*

Now we are ready to admit the premises of this argument, but not the inference which is drawn from it. The fact asserted may be said, with more show of reason, to justify an opposite conclusion ; for, generally, the spurious presupposes the genuine ; the counterfeit imitates the true. One exception may, indeed, be imagined to this rule, and we think of but one. If a prince, for example, were to announce beforehand his purpose to issue, when needed, a particular coin, with such and such marks, counterfeits of this promised coin might, doubtless, be put in circulation before, as well as after, its own appearance. An expectation, resting on the known purpose of their ruler, would predispose many persons to

* *Essays*, vol. II., p. 118, 128.

receive as genuine, without sufficient scrutiny, a worthless imitation of the predicted coin. So in the case of miracles. If God has wrought sundry miracles in past times, or if he has authorized us by a secret bias of our spiritual nature to expect them, the hasty assent given by multitudes to pretended miracles is explicable—but not otherwise. Hence this indiscreet assent does really establish a presumption in favor of the occurrence of miracles in the course of human history, while at the same time the acknowledged presence of counterfeits in that history, warns us to scrutinize keenly the claims of any event to a miraculous character. “The propensity of men,” remarks Dr. Channing, “to believe in what is strange and miraculous, though a presumption against particular miracles, is not a presumption against miracles universally, but rather the reverse; for great principles of human nature have generally a foundation in truth and one explanation of this propensity so common to mankind is obviously this, that in the earlier ages of the human race, miraculous interpositions, suited to man’s infant state, were not uncommon, and, being the most striking facts of human history, they spread through all future times a belief and expectation of miracles.”* The currency of false miracles, we repeat, shows that mankind have been favored, or may justly expect to be favored, with true ones, while it admonishes them to beware of deception in this matter.

II. Of the countless millions of events which have taken their place in the world’s history at any moment since the creation, all, with the rarest exceptions, have been confessedly due to natural causes, and it may therefore be safely inferred that the few events considered exceptional were either illusions, or were due to such causes. “The entire range of the inductive philosophy,” says Baden Powell, “is at once based upon, and every instance tends to confirm by immense accumulation of evidence, the grand truth of the universal order and constancy of natural causes as a primary law of belief;

* Dudleian Lecture at Cambridge, Works, Vol. III., p. 109, sq. This discourse abounds in valuable thoughts.

so strongly entertained and fixed in the mind of every truly inductive inquirer, that he can hardly even conceive the possibility of its failure.”*

If the premise of this argument merely signifies that few events in the world's history have been strictly miraculous, we are ready to adopt it. Our definition of a miracle, as an event which may and must be ascribed to *extraordinary* divine action, implies this. But we do not find in such a statement any basis for the conclusion. The fact that few events, if any, are miraculous, no more proves that none are miraculous, than the fact that few mountains are volcanoes proves that none are volcanoes. The *nature* of the proof is the same in both cases; the *degree* of it is higher in the former instance than in the latter.

Besides, one of the chief ends for which miracles are affirmed to have been wrought, namely, to authenticate a special revelation from God, seems to forbid their indefinite multiplication. Customary events are not the fittest credentials for an extraordinary messenger; and it has been urged with much ingenuity, that miracles would lose their distinctive character and their evidential force if they were to be wrought regularly and often. They would certainly lose in a great measure their power to excite general attention, and so also their practical value in attesting the claims of a messenger from God. Hence, if the chief end to be accomplished by miracles is borne in mind, it will appear that their infrequency, as compared with natural events, does not by itself establish the slightest presumption against their occurrence at certain crises in the history of mankind.

But if the statement that all events, with the rarest exceptions, are due to the operation of natural causes, signifies that they occur independently of any power acting from without and above the laws of matter and necessary causation, we do not accept the statement as true. For within certain narrow limits man himself is free, and has power to act upon the forces and sequences of material nature—to disturb them, to resist them, to combine them,

* Recent Inquiries in Theology, p. 122, sq.

to guide them, to reinforce them ; and hence his action is somewhat akin to the miraculous action of God : it is the working of a free power upon the blind forces of nature ; a power which is able by controlling, by supplementing, or by overpowering them, to carry into effect its own purpose. And if we bear in mind the great number of events which are not determined by the laws of nature, as just explained, but are due to the agency of man, the foundation of the argument before us becomes unstable, and the structure built upon it falls. For though it may still be granted that a vast majority of events do take place according to the laws of nature, it is nevertheless certain that innumerable events are determined by the free agency of man, and so the inference against miracles falls to the ground.*

III. The laws of nature are divine, and therefore inviolable. For God to disturb them, is for him to repudiate his own work, and silence the voice of his own revelation. In the language of Goethe : "An audible voice from heaven could not convince me that water burns ; I rather hold this to be blasphemy against the great God and his revelation in nature." This objection is urged with strong confidence by certain rationalists, and may be deemed their principal argument against miracles. It will therefore be proper for us to scan it closely, and see if it is at all decisive. The expression, "laws of nature," is ambiguous, and needs to be defined. The term "laws" may be taken, in this connection, to signify the regular successions of cause and effect, or antecedent and consequent, which obtain in the universe ; and the term "nature" may be taken to signify all *created* being. Nature is said to be everywhere and always constant in her operations ; the same causes producing uniformly the same effects. To set aside a law of nature is then, we are assured, to sever the tie between cause and effect, and disturb the order of the universe. This is an act which God cannot be supposed in any circumstances

* See Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural*, ch. iii, ix, xi, and Nitzsch, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1843.

to perform. By so doing he would condemn his own works and proclaim his own imperfection.

This objection, we remark, in the first place, assumes the competency of human reason to determine what sort of a creation is worthy of God; for it virtually asserts that any creation worthy of him must issue from his hand so perfect in all its forces and adjustments as to render any subsequent interposition needless. The originating act must be first and final, inserting powers and establishing ordinances which cannot be moved. The Allwise, having cut short his work, must henceforth hold himself aloof from his own creation, or enter it secretly through the channels of rigid law. A universe so constituted as to welcome, now and then, a fresh impulse from the divine hand, a new display of sovereign power, proving to the awed spirits of men that God is more than a principle of order or causation, or development; that He is a holy and loving Father, greater even than the temple of nature—such a universe, we say, is vilified by this objection as imperfect and morally impossible. For what else can be meant by declaring the assertion of a miracle to be “blasphemy against the great God and his revelation in nature?” The assumption respecting the power of human reason which underlies the objection, is an ample refutation of it. For how weak is our reason in its best estate! How dim our spiritual vision because of sin! The idea of man pronouncing an *a priori* judgment on plans of creation and providence is preposterous. It is enough for him to discover and adore the wisdom of God as actually manifested, without pretending to limit the action of Jehovah to particular modes and channels.*

* Compare the remarks of Professor Rothe (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1858, p. 40), on another point: “To deny the possibility of recognizing with *certainly*, in one case, any event as a miracle, because this would presuppose an *absolutely perfect* knowledge of nature, which no man can claim, is also characteristic. For from the bearing of those men, who urge this point with so much pathos, one must certainly conclude that the possibility denied by them exists. How otherwise could they, with such assurance, *absolutely* deny the reality of many miracles related in the Bible, a denial which, upon their stand-point, presupposes in them an *absolute certainty* that those accounts describe *supernatural events*?”

It should, however, be clearly understood, in the second place, that to affirm the occurrence of "events which may and must be ascribed to extraordinary Divine action," is by no means to affirm that events have taken place which were not included in the eternal purpose of God and provided for in the make of the universe. To suppose them an after-thought would be to impeach his omniscience; to suppose them arbitrary, or not grounded in reason, would be to question his wisdom; to suppose them lawless or irregular, that is, now wrought and then omitted in circumstances exactly alike, would be to charge him with caprice; but the Christian Doctrine of Miracles is burdened with no such hypothesis. It assigns to these events a place in the eternal plan and infinite reason of God, and believes them to occur in the exact line of spiritual order. "The laws of God's supernatural agency," says Dr. Bushnell, "are laws of reason, or such as respect his last end, and the best way of compassing that end; which laws are yet so stable and so universal, that he will always do exactly the same things in exactly the same circumstances or conditions."* Nor is it going too far to say that no one has shown this view to be erroneous. Deniers of miracles have for the most part ignored the Christian doctrine on this point, or else have assumed its falsehood as a postulate.

It should also be observed, in the third place, that miracles do not sever the relation between cause and effect, and thus violate, in any proper sense of the word, the essential order of nature. They do suppose the action of a cause *out of* nature and able to direct, re-enforce, or neutralize her powers; but they do not involve anything derogatory to those powers. They are beside nature and above nature, but not contrary to nature. This distinction, as old as Augustine, is not without force and propriety, when properly understood.† It means that miracles are at least in perfect harmony with the structure, the idea, and the end of creation. It means that inor-

* "Nature and the Supernatural," p. 340. † For remarks against this distinction, see Wardlaw "on Miracles," §iv. p. 33, sq. His discussion of the point is ingenious and instructive, but not quite satisfactory.

ganic laws are subordinate to organic, and organic laws to moral, in the plan and working of the universe,* and that the lower are not dishonored, but rather glorified by a fellowship, even of subordination, with the higher. Alone in their sphere the laws or forces of inorganic matter act invariably, but when matter is made organic by life, higher laws prevail and the lower succumb. In obedience to the same principle, organic laws must yield to moral; for according to God's plan all other ends are tributary to moral ones in his creation. "The great purpose of God," says Dr. Channing, "in establishing the order of nature, is to form and advance the mind; and if the case should occur in which the interests of the mind could best be advanced by departing from this order, or by miraculous agency, then the great purpose of the creation, the great end of its laws and regularity, would demand such departure; and miracles, instead of *warring against*, would *concur* with nature."† Dr. Chalmers maintains that, properly speaking, miracles do not disturb the constancy of nature — do not suspend the law of cause and effect. "A miracle," he remarks, "is no infringement of the order of cause and effect, for this special intromission of the Divine will is the introduction of a new cause, making the causal antecedent different from what it was before."‡ "As the entrance of new personalities into the world," says Schenkel, "does not involve the destruction of those already present, so neither does the entrance into the world of absolute creative acts by the hand of God involve the destruction of existing natural connections." Again, "it cannot in fact be seen how the connection and order of nature should be *destroyed* by the creation of some loaves immediately by the power of God, in place of their being prepared by the hand of the baker, or by his freeing some persons who were sick from their disease by his direct agency, instead of their being healed by the virtues of medicine."§ "But the laws of experience, on which in

* Compare *Nitzsch*, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1843, p. 39; *Trench*, "Notes on the Miracles," p. 21, sq., and *Worldlaw*, cited above. † Dupleian Lecture at Cambridge. ‡ "Institutes of Theology," vol. i. p. 170, note. § *Christliche Dogmatik*, vol. i. p. 258 and 259.

general our knowledge rests, how in the world," inquires Rothe, "can they be *endangered* by acts supernaturally wrought, *if these acts offer themselves expressly to experience as not caused by the course of nature?*"* This much is certainly true, that miracles do not shake in the least degree the great principle that every change has a cause, and that the cause being the same in all respects the effect will always be the same. The tie which binds together cause and effect is not therefore severed by any miracle however surprising.

We have now considered the principle reasons which are said to render the occurrence of miracles incredible, or to the last degree improbable, and have found them to be unsatisfactory. Nay more, they are overbalanced by a general presumption of some miraculously attested revelation from God. Of *some* such revelation, not of *many* such, and these disconnected, inharmonious, clashing.† Hence the propriety of scrutinizing carefully the testimony for alleged miracles. Indeed, the objections which have been noticed, while they utterly fail of establishing a presumption against the occurrence of miracles in general, do seem to justify a very cautious sifting of the testimony in support of particular ones, lest counterfeits be welcomed as genuine. We propose therefore to examine by some care a few of those narratives of miracles wrought by Christ which are contained in the four Gospels.

In making this examination, we shall refer very often to the *naturalistic* and *mythical* explanations of the record, and will therefore briefly characterize these two methods of interpretation. The naturalistic method, assuming the impossibility of miracles, undertakes to show *that the writers of the four gospels nowhere ascribe any to Christ*. The mythical hypoth-

* Studien und Kritiken, 1858, p. 29. We should be glad to translate pages from this article, but can only commend it to the attention of our readers.

† See a beautiful passage in Channing's Dudleian Lecture, Works, vol. iii, p. 119. We would also refer to *Mansel* on "Miracles," in "Aids to Faith," *Hurtley* on "Miracles," in "Replies to Essays and Reviews," *Philippi*, Kirchliche Glaubenslehre, i. p. 24, sq. *Schmid* (C. T.) "Biblische Theologie des N. T." § 17 p. 85, sq., as presenting the argument for miracles in a clear light. These are mentioned as a part of the recent literature of the subject.

esis, on the other hand, admits that the evangelists do ascribe miracles to Christ, but, denying the possibility of their occurrence, maintains that *the marvellous stories recorded in the gospels were originated by the early Christians*, who took the liberty of attributing to Jesus, the Messiah, such works as in their opinion befitted his character and office. At the head of the naturalistic interpreters stands the name of *Paulus*, and at the head of the mythical, that of *Strauss*. We shall have occasion frequently to give the opinions of these men.

The Miracles of Christ may be divided into two classes, viz : those wrought upon *human nature* and those wrought upon the *material world*. We shall take them up in this order; and,

I. *Miracles on Human Nature.*

For the sake of clearness this large class of miracles may be subdivided into sections, as follows :

Section I. *Healing Mortal Sickesses.* Jo. iv: 46-54; Matt. viii: 14-17; Mr. i: 29-34; Luke iv: 38-41; Luke xiv: 1-6; Matt. viii: 5-13; Luke vii: 1-10.

We begin with the Healing of the Nobleman's Son, related by John iv: 46-54 :

(a.) This miracle is not identical, as a few interpreters have supposed, with the healing of the centurion's servant, recorded by Matthew viii: 5-13, and Luke vii: 1-10. For while there are but two points of coincidence, viz: that in both cases the person cured was in Capernaum, and the miracle described was wrought from a distance; there are many points of difference, *e. g.*, in the former narrative Christ is said to have been at Cana, but in the latter at Capernaum; in the former he is said to have wrought the miracle just after his return from the passover through Samaria, in the latter just after his coming down from the place of his "Sermon on the Mount;" in the former the person healed is called a son of the petitioner, in the latter a servant of the petitioner; in the former the petitioner is denominated a βασιλικος, in the latter a ἑκατονταρχος; in the former he appears to be a Jew, in the latter he is a Gentile; in the former he is represented as a man of weak faith, in the latter as a man of great faith; in the former

Christ virtually refuses to go with him to his house, in the latter he offers to go thither with him. These points of difference are so many and so important as to preclude the hypothesis of a single miracle being the basis of narratives so unlike. We must therefore examine the narrative of John by itself.

(b.) The naturalistic interpretation of John's record is clearly untenable. For, according to this interpretation, Jesus merely assures the father that his son's life is out of danger—"thy son liveth"—without intimating any agency of his own in the case. By his accurate knowledge of disease, it is supposed, he was able to infer from the nobleman's description of his son's state that the crisis was now reached, and that the issue must be favorable. But this view of the narrative does not accord with the final remark of John: "This is again the second sign—σημεῖον, which Jesus did," compared with the first response of Christ to the nobleman; "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe." For the word "sign" is here used by the evangelist to signify no less than what Christ had spoken of as "signs and wonders." The nobleman had, indeed, a kind of faith when he first applied to Jesus for help, and this faith had become yet stronger when he believed the word of Christ: "thy son liveth;" but it was very imperfect and liable to be shaken until he learned that the fever departed at the very time when Jesus uttered that decisive word: then "he *believed* and all his house"—thus verifying exactly our Saviour's remark: "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe." Moreover, this view does not accord with the impression which seems to have been made on the nobleman's mind by the reply of Christ: "Thy son liveth." Just before this reply he pleads with all a father's heart: "Come down, ere my child die;" he feels that something must be done, or his son will surely die; but hearing the word of Jesus, he at once believes it. Was that word the mere utterance of a medical opinion? or, was there in it a pledge of healing by the power of Christ? If the latter—if there was that in the tone and emphasis of Jesus which affirmed a miraculous interposition on his part—we can under-

stand its effect; but if it was the former, we cannot. Nor does this view accord with the wisdom and rectitude for which Christ was preëminent. To pronounce safe the life of one who was in a high fever and seemingly at the point of death, and especially to do this without seeing the sufferer, can hardly be vindicated as a prudent act, however great the pathological knowledge of the physician. Much less, if a miracle of knowledge be excluded, can such an act be reconciled with the spotless integrity of Jesus. An assurance so positive as to satisfy the father* presupposes for its basis either divine knowledge or moral recklessness.

(c.) The mythical interpretation is likewise untenable. Admitting that the writer of the fourth gospel means to record a miracle in the passage before us, this interpretation impeaches his testimony by asserting, (1) that believers in Jesus as the promised Messiah, would naturally assume his superiority to all the ancient prophets in working miracles, and would therefore ascribe to him every sort of miracle fitted to excite special wonder; and (2) that in the case of Naaman, the Syrian, a supernatural cure was effected by bathing in the Jordan, while the prophet, at whose word the miracle was wrought, remained at a distance in his own house. To surpass this Old Testament miracle Jesus must effect as great a cure from a distance, by his mere word: he was therefore *presumed* to have done this, and a story embodying the presumption was by degrees put in circulation. Against this view may be urged,

(1.) The *style* of the narrative before us. For this bears all the marks of truth; it is simple, minute, graphic, objective. It says nothing of the motives of Christ or of the nobleman; it eulogizes neither, criticizes neither; it confines itself to a bare recital of the events as they transpired. We are unable to detect the slightest effort to do more than this or less than this.

(2.) The *contents* of the narrative. A fever is by no means

* The father did not return till the next day. Did the next day begin at even tide, so that the nobleman reached Capernaum late in the evening?

so incurable a disease as leprosy. Hence, if John's account had been invented to offset and surpass the miracle of Naaman's cleansing, not a fever, but leprosy, or some other disease as difficult to remove as this, would have been subjected to the healing word of Christ.

(3.) The *relations* of the narrative. It is a portion of the fourth gospel, homogeneous with all other portions. The blow which assails its truth assails the truth of the whole gospel, nay of all the gospels. This is but faintly denied by those who defend the mythical hypothesis. But the style and contents of the gospels are utterly opposed to this hypothesis. In proof of this statement, we venture to quote a few sentences from Greenleaf on the "*Testimony of the Evangelists.*" Speaking of "internal marks of truth in the narratives of the evangelists," he says: "Among these may be mentioned the nakedness of the narratives, the absence of all parade by the writers, about their own integrity, of all anxiety to be believed, or to impress others with a good opinion of themselves or their cause, of all marks of wonder, or of desire to excite astonishment at the greatness of the events they record, and of all appearance of design to exalt their Master. On the contrary, there is apparently the most perfect indifference on their part, whether they are believed or not; or rather, the evident consciousness that they were recording events well known to all, in their own country and times, and undoubtedly to be believed, like any other matter of public history, by readers in all other countries and ages. It is worthy, too, of especial observation, that though the evangelists record the unparalleled sufferings and cruel death of their beloved Lord, and this, too, by the hands and with the consenting voices of those on whom he had conferred the greatest benefits, and their own persecutions and dangers, yet they have bestowed no epithets of harshness, or even of just censure, on the authors of all this wickedness, but have everywhere left the plain and unincumbered narrative to speak for itself, and the reader to pronounce his own sentence of condemnation; like true witnesses, who have nothing to gain or to lose by the event of the cause, they state the facts, and leave them to their fate. Their sim-

plicity and artlessness, also, should not pass unnoticed in readily stating even those things most disparaging to themselves. Their want of faith in their master, their dulness of apprehension of his teachings, their strifes for preëminence, their inclination to call fire from heaven upon their enemies, their desertion of their Lord in the hour of extreme peril; these, and many other incidents tending directly to their own dishonor, are nevertheless set down with all the directness and sincerity of truth, as by men writing under the deepest sense of responsibility to God."

It would be easy to select many other paragraphs from his essay on the "*Testimony of the Four Evangelists*," no less pertinent and powerful than the one now read, but it will be wiser for us to request our readers to examine the essay for themselves. We must not, however, omit to add that the period which elapsed between the death of Christ and the publication of the gospels was far too brief for the invention of so extensive and homogeneous a cycle of myths. Without insisting upon the utter absurdity of tracing narratives so artless in style, so perfect in morality, so godlike in aim, and blending so harmoniously with the whole life and teaching of Jesus, to the inventive genius of the early Christians, the growth of such legends must be a work of time. The first germs of them could hardly have been originated before the death of Christ's immediate disciples. And surely it must take a long time for the development of the earliest germs of such narratives, as we find in the gospels, to their full maturity. They could not have been brought by any human agency into their present forms, without many revisions and readjustments. The reasons now alleged do plainly forbid the application of the mythical hypothesis to the gospels as a whole, and to the passage before us in particular.

In conclusion, we submit the following remarks on the record of John. (1) The events related might be known by observation. The journey, the dialogues, the departure of fever, might fall under the notice of the senses. Even faith, as bearing fruit in life, is a proper matter of observation. (2) The

events related were public. All was done in open day ; had it been otherwise, we may be sure that the writer of this gospel, according to his general practice, would have told us. (3) The events related were likely to attract attention. The father, who applied to Christ, was a man of some consequence, being in the service of Herod Antipas, and Jesus himself had drawn upon him the eyes of many by his mighty works in Jerusalem. Besides, in view of the son's cure, this whole family believed on Christ — a fact adapted to make the miracle an object of deeper interest. (4) John, the writer of this account, was at home in the neighborhood, and soon after this event dwelt for sometime with Jesus in Capernaum. He had, therefore, beyond any reasonable doubt, the privilege of familiar intercourse with the nobleman and his family, as well as with Christ. (5) The miracle related agrees in character with all others wrought by Christ, and with the declared object of his mission. For it served the two-fold purpose of revealing his spirit and of ratifying his authority. It had a message of its own in addition to its endorsement of the words of Jesus. (6) The bearing of Christ, his seeming repulse of the nobleman, and his subsequent compliance with his request, agree with his bearing on other occasions. It was almost a custom with him to test the faith of such as wished his aid, to expose its weakness or verify its greatness, and when imperfect yet sincere, to strengthen it by the gracious exercise of his power. But when there was no faith, yea, rather, morbid, wonder-seeking curiosity, without moral root, when the faith generated by miracles would have been "unbelief in the form of belief" (Luthardt, Joh. i. 365), he refused to perform any mighty work. Such an act would have been casting pearls before swine. And so, the real harmony (emerging from apparent discrepancy) between our Saviour's course with the nobleman (possibly Chuza, Luke viii: 3) and his course with the Scribes and Pharisees who would see a sign (Math. xi: 38-46, xvi: 1-4) is manifest but undesigned, and therefore an evidence of the truth of the gospel.

But we pass on to the accounts of another miracle, viz :

The healing of Peter's wife's mother, Math. viii : 14-17, Mark i : 29-34, and Luke iv: 38-41. The different records of this miracle furnish a good illustration of the manner in which several independent witnesses of an event sustain one another. The particulars given by each separate witness are found to be consistent, when not identical with those given by all the rest. This remark will be verified as we proceed. We invite attention to the following points.

(1) The house in which the miracle was wrought is called by Matthew "the house of Peter," by Mark, "the house of Simon and Andrew," and by Luke, "the house of Simon." Here it may be observed as a slight note of independence, that two of the evangelists give to Peter his early name, Simon, while one of them makes use of his later name, Peter. A similar note may be found in the circumstance that two of them call the house Peter's, while one, and that one Mark, speaks of it as the house of Simon and Andrew. As property it may have belonged equally to the two brothers, but Peter, who was the leading personality generally, may have been especially prominent in this case, because the house was occupied by his own family ; by his mother-in-law, at least, and probably by his wife also. Yet it is by no means certain that the brothers were owners of the house (the genitive does not *require* us to suppose this) ; it may have belonged to the parents of Peter's wife and have been merely the house of the two brothers while Jesus abode in Capernaum ; but on this hypothesis also, though still the residence of both the brothers, it might have been such by virtue of Peter's connection with the family, and so would have been called by the disciples generally, Peter's house. Bruno Bauer professes to see a contradiction between the statement that Peter and Andrew were householders in Capernaum, and the words of John (i: 45), that Bethsaida was the city of Andrew and Peter. We should as soon think of getting a sight of the single hair from an angel's head, exhibited twenty years by a priest who could never make out to see it himself, as of catching a glimpse of the point of inconsistency between these statements. To an ordinary mind, there would seem to be no absurdity in supposing

that two brothers might be natives of one city, and yet on occasion lease or even buy a house in another. But even this supposition is unnecessary ; for it is quite possible that nothing more was meant by "the house of Simon and Andrew," than the house where they dwelt. It may not be amiss to notice also, in this place, the fact that James and John, as Mark informs us, accompanied Jesus into the house. The omission of the other two evangelists to put on record this fact needs no explanation ; relatively it was a very unimportant circumstance, yet not on that account without historical value ; for it shows that the miracle before us, was wrought in the presence of several witnesses.

(2.) Matthew says that Peter's mother-in-law was "laid and sick of a fever," Mark, that she "lay sick of a fever," and Luke, that she "was taken with a great fever." The first two represent her as prostrated by an active fever, and the last, making use of a current medical distinction, describes her as being in the power of a *great* fever. The phraseology of the witnesses is here different and to all appearance independent (I cannot agree with Alford), yet their testimony is not only accordant, but almost identical, in meaning. No jury could reject such testimony.

(3.) Matthew says that Jesus having come into the house, "*saw*" Peter's mother-in-law sick ; Mark says that "they immediately spoke to him about her;" and Luke, that "they asked him about her." Mark and Luke here supply a fact passed over by Matthew, yet merely a subordinate one, in all respects consistent with his narrative. As Jesus entered the house he was reminded of the sufferer, and asked, perhaps, if he would restore her health. At once he approached her bedside, looked upon her with compassion, and wrought a miraculous cure. The company may have entered first, not the sick room, but another, and in this Jesus may have been spoken to and questioned, as two of the evangelists relate, while as he entered the sick room he may have fixed his eyes on the sufferer and proceeded at once to effect her recovery. This is perhaps the most probable representation.

(4) In describing the miracle, Matthew says that Jesus

"touched her hand and the fever left her;" Mark, that he "took her by the hand and lifted her up and immediately the fever left her;" and Luke, that he "stood over her and rebuked the fever and it left her." Here again is real harmony with seeming diversity. He "touched her hand," he "took her hand and lifted her up," he "stood over her and rebuked the fever." The verb *ἥψατο* used by the first evangelist and translated "touched," is not inconsistent with Mark's statement, that he "*took* her hand;" for it signifies, according to the best lexicographers, to cling to, lay hold of, or grasp; and though it may be often employed in the New Testament to denote a slight contact, it here retains its original power. On the other hand the verb *ἤγειρεν*, which is rendered in our version "lifted up," signifies primarily "to awaken," "to rouse up," and then, dropping the reference to sleep, "to cause to rise, or to raise." It does not therefore intimate that Christ lifted up the sick woman by strength of arm. Nor does Luke's statement that he "stood over her and rebuked the fever," conflict with the idea of his taking her hand. The several statements are complementary to one another, giving us a lively picture of the whole scene. As Jesus took the sufferer's hand within his own he spoke the word which Luke commemorates; instantly the fever departed, health pervaded her entire being, and following the gentle impulse of his hand she arose. Each narrative is true so far as it goes, each gives enough to show the source of the healing power, but all are necessary to the completeness of the picture in detail.

(5.) The cure was perfect as well as instantaneous. The fever left her, say all the accounts, and "she ministered unto them." "The completeness of her restoration," says Alexander, "was evinced by her returning to her ordinary household duties, so that she who just before lay helpless in their presence, was now serving them," that is, with food, etc. Such a result can only be ascribed to extraordinary Divine action.

In the evening after this day, when the sun was set (for it had been a Sabbath), the people, as we are told by the same evangelists, brought to him in large numbers those who were sick, and he healed them all. A careful scrutiny of the several

narratives of this miraculous activity (Matt. viii : 16, 17; Mr. i: 32-34; Luke iv: 40, 41) will disclose the same harmony in diversity which has already attracted our attention. But we must ask our readers to make this examination for themselves. Matthew, however, says these miracles of healing were performed, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses," and we cannot pass over this declaration without remark. It may be the key to a great mystery, and we think it is. The words quoted by the evangelist are descriptive, in the original passage, of vicarious suffering. It is next to impossible to understand them otherwise. Hence in the miraculous healing of diseases Jesus suffered vicariously, redemptively. His anguish in the garden and on the cross was but the *culmination* of that which he felt almost daily, while healing the sick, cleansing the leprous, or forgiving the penitent. By the holy sharpness of his vision he pierced quite through the veil of sense and natural causes, and saw in *moral evil* the black root of all disorder, the source of all suffering. He could therefore heal neither bodily nor spiritual disease without a deep consciousness of his special relation to both as the Substitute, the Redeemer, the Lamb of God, who was to bear the penalty of a world's guilt. And it is not, we believe, too much to suppose that by a superhuman and perfect sympathy (compassion) he took into his own holy consciousness, and truly realized the bodily as well as the spiritual suffering which he removed from others. As works of *authority* or *power* it was easy for Christ to say effectually: "Thy sins are forgiven thee," or "Rise, take up thy bed and walk," but as works of *redeeming grace* they cost him unspeakable anguish. If these remarks are just, the language of Matthew offers us a glimpse of moral law the most profound, and of spiritual processes the most affecting. It lifts the miraculous agency of Christ into a more vital union with the great end of his mediatorial work, and justifies us in extracting a deep and definite sense from the words of Jesus, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

In this section we have also placed the healing of the man

who had the dropsy, as recorded by Luke xiv : 1-6; but not without hesitation, since the only account of this miracle transmitted to us is very brief, giving no clue to the progress which had been made already by the disease. As, however, the dropsy is often incurable, it may be presumed that the man who now came to Jesus, despaired of help from any other quarter. Paulus, denying as usual that the evangelist intends to represent Christ as working a miracle, remarks : " One has no reason to think that here was a *hydrops consummatus*, and only by such an hypothesis does the event become incredible." But does not the language of Luke suppose the instantaneous recovery of the sick man? And by what medical process has the dropsy ever been at once removed? Paulus also says that " Jesus probably took the man aside, and examined the effect of the remedies previously used." But of this there is no intimation in the text; indeed just the opposite may fairly be inferred from it. The cure was wrought publicly in the presence of men who were watching for an opportunity to accuse the Saviour of disobedience to the law. Hence his question : " Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath?" and his justification of the act : " Which of you shall have an ass, or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath day?" The miracle before us is related very briefly, as we have said; it has therefore received less attention from sceptics than many others, and obviously it must stand or fall with those which are narrated more at length. Yet the record of this event by Luke bears every mark of truthfulness, consistent with such brevity. His language is clear, direct, unambiguous. The event did not take place in a corner. It was preceded by an important query, adapted to fix every eye upon Jesus and the afflicted man before him, and it was followed by an unanswerable justification. The scene was not easy to forget.

Finally we have placed in this section the healing of the centurion's servant, recorded in Matt. viii : 5-13, and Lu. vii : 1-10. On these accounts we remark :

(a.) Their diversities may be easily reconciled. *E. g.*, Strauss observes that the sufferer is called by Luke a *δοῦλος*

ἐντιμος, but by the Centurion in Matthew ὁ παῖς μου; yet he neglects to observe that he is called by the Centurion in Luke ὁ παῖς μου (v: 7). Besides the word παῖς may signify either son or servant. The difference between the two evangelists is evidently a note of independence and truthfulness. Again, as to the disease, Luke says that he was "sick and ready to die," and Matthew that he was "sick of the palsy and grievously tormented." As to the *kind* of disease the latter is more specific, as to the *stage* of it the former is more explicit. But there is no contradiction between them, unless it can be shown that a man "sick of the palsy" cannot be "ready to die." Lastly, the Centurion himself, according to the first evangelist, came to Jesus with his request, while, according to the third, he sent the elders of the Jews to bear it. But "this diversity," says Dr. Robinson, "is satisfactorily explained by the old law maxim: *Qui facit per alium, facit per se*. Matthew narrates briefly; Luke gives the circumstances more fully." (See Jo. iv: 1, 2; xix: 1; Mr. x: 35; Matt. xx: 20; II. Sam. xxiv: 1; I. Chr. xxi: 1.)

(b.) The points of agreement between them are essential. *E. g.*, both narratives unite in saying, (1) that Jesus was now returning from the place of his Sermon on the Mount; (2) that he had just entered Capernaum when the request for aid met him; (3) that the petitioner was a Centurion; (4) that Jesus was disposed to go to the Centurion's house, and heal his servant; (5) that the Centurion objected to his going, and for two reasons; (6) that one of these reasons indicated deep humility, "I am not worthy," etc.; (7) that the other evinced strong faith, "Speak the word only," etc.; (8) that to explain his faith he made use of a very apt and natural illustration; (9) that Jesus yielded without remonstrance to his objection; (10) that he observed his faith with wonder; (11) that he commended his faith without speaking of his humility; (12) that in commending his faith he compared it with what he had found in Israel; (13) that according to his faith his servant was at once healed, and that, too, from a distance. These certainly are numerous and striking points of coincidence. And it may be added that the character of the Centurion is

essentially the same in both narratives, though his humility is perhaps more fully illustrated in that of Luke. So, too, the bearing of Christ is the same in both narratives. These coincidences are unaccountable on any hypothesis, but that of historical truth.

(c.) The naturalistic interpretation assumes that Jesus was either asked by the Centurion to give a prescription merely, which could be easily applied by a servant, or else to send one of his disciples to see and cure the patient. Paulus advocates the latter view, but is shown to be in error by Strauss. The closing verse of Luke's narrative sets aside the hypothesis of a gradual restoration. Christ's wonder at the Centurion's faith is equally fatal to that hypothesis. To suppose a military officer illustrating his belief that Christ had sufficient authority over his disciples to send one of them to a sick man with medicine, is well nigh absurd; to suppose that Jesus was astonished at so great faith in his authority as a Master or skill as a leech, is altogether absurd.

(d.) The mythical interpretation of these narratives has been already given. Strauss labors hard to show that they are merely different versions of the story recorded by John iv: 46-54; a story which grew out of the impression that Jesus, as the true Messiah, must have wrought miracles at a distance, since he was greater than any of the ancient prophets. Our reply to this theory need not be repeated.

§ II. *Healing Chronic Diseases.*

Matt. ix: 1-8; Mr. ii: 1-12; Lu. v: 17-26; Matt. xii: 9-13;

(NOTE α) The solicitude of the Centurion for his servant agrees very well with his generous spirit toward the Jews, for whom he had built, it is said, a synagogue.

(NOTE β) The circumstance of his not being a Jew may have led him to employ the "elders" to present his request, and also to think that Jesus would prefer not to enter his house.

(NOTE γ) The word palsy or paralysis was used more comprehensively by the ancients than it is by the moderns. It was applied to disease attended by excruciating pains, as the gout, as well as to disease affecting the nerves of volition merely. (See Winer's R. W. B. Article, *Paralytische*; also, Trench on the Miracles, p. 18, and I. Mac. ix: 55, 56, where Alcimus "taken with the palsy," is said to have died presently with "great torment.")

Mr. iii: 1-5; Lu. vi: 6-11; Jo. v: 1-17; Lu. xiii: 10-17; Matt. ix: 20-22; Mr. v: 25-34; Lu. viii: 43-48; Matt. viii: 1-4; Mr. i: 40-45; Lu. v: 12-16; Lu. xvii: 11-19.

To begin with the Healing of the Paralytic recorded by Matt. ix: 1-8; Mr. ii: 1-10, and Lu. vii: 17-26, we observe—
(a.) That these narratives are in no respect contradictory. A chronological disagreement between the first evangelist and the other two has indeed been alleged, but not proved; for Matthew and Mark, surely, do not profess to give the events of our Saviour's life in the order of time. Says Westcott (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, page 344): "An inspired order is the correlative of an inspired abridgement;" and further on: "The examination of a few chapters of the Synoptical Gospels will leave little doubt that temporal sequence was not the standard of their arrangement." If this remark is true of all the Synoptical Gospels, it is pre-eminently true of the first. We are therefore persuaded that some of the events recounted by Matthew, prior to the miracle before us, took place after it. This is probably true of the Sermon on the Mount.

Again, the accounts which Mark and Luke give of this miracle, or rather of the events preliminary to it, are said to be very different from that of Matthew. Admitting the difference, we deny any discrepancy. The first gospel says that "they brought to Jesus a paralytic lying on a bed;" the third says the same, but notes also the fact that, owing to a great crowd, they had to take the sick man "upon the house and let him down with the bed through the tiles;" and the second says the same, adding only this, that the paralytic was "borne of four," and that they "made a hole through the roof in order to let him down." Surely addition and explanation are not contradiction; and here is no ground whatever for impeaching the truth of these narratives.

Again, Matthew calls the couch on which the paralytic was borne a *κλίνη*, Mark, a *κράββατος*, and Luke, a *κλίνη*, and a *κλινίδιον*; but there is no reason whatever for doubting the fitness of any one of these terms to describe the article in question. It can hardly be presumed that Luke contradicts

himself, and yet he uses the very word employed by Matthew, and a synonym, likewise, for the one employed by Mark. Indeed, the use of three different terms by the three evangelists to designate the same article proves the independence of their testimony, and enhances its value. But there is another variation: Matthew and Mark agree in testifying that Jesus addressed the paralytic by the title "child," while Luke gives the word "man," as used in the address—*τέκνον*—*ἄνθρωπέ*. This difference is worthy of close examination. We may suppose that our Saviour uttered the word "man," but with a look and tone which made it equivalent to the more kindly and gracious term "child." If so, and if he spoke in Aramaic, Luke has translated *ad litteram*, Matthew and Mark *ad sensum*. The former has given us more exactly the word of Jesus, but not so fully his meaning as the latter. Or we may suppose that our Saviour used the term "child," but with a look and tone fitly represented by the term "man;" in which case Matthew and Mark may be said to preserve the *letter*, while Luke preserves the *spirit*, of the address. But with still greater reason may we suppose that in the word of Christ, as uttered by him, was contained the sense of both these terms, or a sense intermediate between the two, so that by yielding our minds to the influence of both, allowing each to modify the other, we obtain the best possible idea of his meaning. If, however, this last hypothesis be correct, why, it may be asked, was not each one of the evangelists led by inspiration to put both these words into the lips of Jesus? Because, we reply, this would have misrepresented the style, and weakened the force of his speech. His words were powerful, because they were all freighted with deep meaning. His language was condensed. To have expanded his discourses by a paraphrase would have been to mar their beauty and strength. Better give nine-tenths of his meaning in one word than all of it in two; for the very style of our Saviour's teaching revealed his divinity.

We observe,

(b.) That these narratives agree in all essential points. They agree, *e. g.*, in affirming, (1) that the miracle recorded was

wrought in a house; (2) that the disease cured was paralysis; (3) that the sufferer was brought to Jesus on a couch; (4) that Christ acted in view of "*their* faith"—the faith of more than one; (5) that he first said to the paralytic, "Thy sins are forgiven thee;" (6) that some of the Scribes (and Pharisees, Lu.) who sat by, reasoned in their hearts, charging him with blasphemy; (7) that Christ knew their thoughts, and reproved them; (8) that he placed the claim of power to forgive sins on the same level with the claim of power to cure paralysis by a word; (9) that he began to state his willingness to assure them of his power to do the former by doing the latter; (10) that instead of completing this statement in words addressed to the Scribes, he finished it by words of power addressed to the paralytic; (11) that he thus claimed for the Son of Man upon earth power to forgive sins; (12) that he directed the sufferer before him to rise, take his own couch, and go to his house; (13) that the paralytic at once arose and went forth, according to this direction; (14) that the people saw this, and were filled with astonishment. Some of these coincidences are very exact and striking. For instance, the words of Jesus: "Thy sins are forgiven thee," are precisely the same in all; the question: "Whether is it easier to say?" etc., is almost the same in all; and the unfinished address to the Scribes is exactly the same in all. The last instance is especially worthy of consideration; for the form of the sentence is peculiar and in all probability just that used by Christ. It is also noticeable that Jesus, in this address, calls the attention of captious men on the spot to this miracle as an evidence of his divine prerogatives.

We may also observe,

(c.) That the naturalistic interpretation of these passages is untenable. According to Paulus, Christ perceived that the paralytic now put before him was of a melancholy temperament, and thoroughly disheartened by the belief that his weakness was a punishment from God for past sins. He also perceived that the man had really strength to walk, if he could be induced to use it. The first thing, therefore, was to destroy his superstitious notion of a divine judgment resting

upon him in the form of sickness. This Jesus effected by saying to him, with an assured and decisive tone: 'Thy sins have been forgiven thee.' As, however, this language was misinterpreted by the Scribes, he said to them in effect: "I could as easily have said at first: 'Thou shalt be made whole,' as to have said: 'Thy sins have been forgiven thee,' but it was necessary to say the latter to remove his dejection and effect his recovery. Having thus prepared the way, Christ directs the paralytic to rise up and walk. Inspired with new confidence the poor man makes the effort, and is successful. The work is now virtually done, for joyful in hope he will rapidly recover."

Such is the exposition of Paulus, ingenious but unsound.

(1.) It does not accord with the remark of all three evangelists, that the first words of Christ were uttered in view of "*their* faith." The efficacy of his words in removing a false impression and inspiring hope might depend on the faith of the supposed hypochondriac, but not on that of his friends. Yet the gospels are not careful to say that the paralytic himself was one of those who believed; much less do they intimate that his confidence in Jesus was especially necessary, was in fact *the* prerequisite to a cure.

(2.) It does not accord with the import of Christ's words to the paralytic: "Thy sins are forgiven thee." For resting on the tense* of the verb it translates: "Thy sins have been forgiven thee," and supposes the sentence merely didactic. But the perfect is here used as an emphatic present, and the language is plainly authoritative. So it was understood by the Scribes (Matt. ix: 3; Lu. v: 21; Mr. ii: 7), and so it was explained by Christ himself (Matt. ix: 6; Mr. ii: 20; Lu. v: 24.)

(3.) It does not accord with Christ's answer to the Scribes: "Whether is it easier," etc. They had charged him in their hearts with arrogating a prerogative of God by professing to forgive sins. Instead of rejecting this interpretation of his language, his entire reply accepts and endorses it. This is

* The reading is doubtful, but the best authorities give the *perfect* instead of the *present*.

true of the question to which we now particularly refer. For this question evidently places the forgiving of sins and the instantaneous cure of the sick on the same level. Says Meyer: "The sense (without a question) is this: The one is no easier to say than the other, to both belongs the same divine *ἐξουσία*; but that ye may know that I have said the former with full right, I will now add the latter."

(4.) It does not accord with the impression made by the event. The great astonishment produced by the change in the paralytic can only be explained by supposing a real miracle. The cure was instantaneous. The paralytic went out whole and strong.

(d.) The mythical interpretation is equally untenable. It finds a motive for this legend in Isa. xxxv: 3 and 6: "Strengthen ye the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees," and "then shall the lame man leap as an hart." "In view of these passages," says Strauss, "a derivation of the gospel narratives from Messianic expectations is exceedingly obvious." Yet he is in favor of accepting a naturalistic view of the occurrence. Jesus may have effected the recovery of one suffering from mental depression and nervous weakness by words of cheer leading him to put forth his energies. This hypothesis has been already considered. It would now be easy to show that the three narratives in question do not represent a popular legend. The points of coincidence are too numerous, and the seeming discrepancies too obvious to admit of such an explanation. It cannot, however, be necessary to specify them in detail.

Here we must pause, for the limited space which can be given to a single article is filled. The miracles, thus far examined, are among those which have given least trouble to naturalists; others, not yet considered, have taxed their powers of invention and perversion far more severely. Should an opportunity be presented for completing our examination and combining the results of it, the testimony in support of our Saviour's miracles will be seen to possess amazing strength and clearness.

ARTICLE IV.—UNIVERSITY SERMONS.

[BY AN OLD CONTRIBUTOR.]

- 1.—*Sermons delivered in the Chapel of Brown University, by FRANCIS WAYLAND, President of the University.* Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1849.
- 2.—*The Christian Life, in two volumes. I.—Its course, its hindrances, and its helps. II.—Its hopes, its fears, and its close.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D. D., Head Master of Rugby School. [From the fifth London edition.] Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1856.
- 3.—*Christian Believing and Living. Sermons by F. D. HUNTINGTON, D. D., Preacher to the University, and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard College.* Boston: Crosby, Nichols, Lee & Co. 1860.
- 4.—*Twelve Sermons, delivered at Antioch College, by HORACE MANN, President of the College.* Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.
- 5.—*Sermons delivered in the Chapel of Harvard College, by JAMES WALKER, D. D., President.* Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1862.

SEVERAL of our older and larger colleges and universities find it convenient, and, as they think, useful to secure the usual ministrations of the Sabbath and the sanctuary in their own chapels, and to a great degree separate from ordinary mixed assemblies. Accordingly the president, the chaplain, or whosoever may be the preacher selected for this service, is expected to make the peculiar age, character and destination of his audience *a specialty*, or at least to hold all these very prominently in view in the selection and discussion of his themes. Discourses of this character have considerably multiplied of late, and the teeming press has sent forth ample specimens of them. Nor can it fail to be recognized as emi-

nently suitable to subject such of them as fall in our way, to careful and candid review.

Such discourses are indeed no novelty. President Appleton of Bowdoin College, Prof. Tappan of Harvard, Dr. Dwight, the bright particular star of Yale, Witherspoon of Nassau Hall, Davies of William and Mary, and Maxcy, successively President of Brown and Union at the North, and of the College of South Carolina at the South, among the men of a generation passed away, all preached to students, and gave more or less of their discourses of this character to the press. Some of them—as Dwight, Appleton and Tappan—delivered courses of sermons embracing a complete system of Theology. Such a course was more needful before Theological Seminaries existed among us. So far as we are advised, such a complete system of Christian doctrines is not now attempted in any, or very few at most, of these institutions. It is rather the aim of such sermons now, to secure the Christian instruction and edification of the young men to whom they are delivered. Religious culture, in the broad acceptance of the term, is the noble object to which such discourses are directed.*

On the very threshold of our theme, its magnitude and sacredness impress us. To preach the gospel efficiently, to any human being, involves consequences of unutterable moment. The poorest, the humblest, the least influential have souls, and to rescue and recover such from the bottomless pit, instrumentally to imbue them with the new life and hope, the purity and peace which Jesus gives to all who believe the gospel message, is indeed a work of transcendent interest and importance. But how obviously are these enhanced, when the hearers of this gospel message are those preparing to exert on the community of this and future generations the greatest influence. To become the moulds into which many others will be cast, the pattern which myriads

* Of course this view does not embrace such courses of lectures as the Bampton and Hulsean in the English Universities. These latter have a high and worthy aim; but it chiefly regards the graduates, the fellows and other friends and teachers, not the undergraduate students.

will imitate, the seed which is to be resown and produce its thirty, sixty, and hundred fold. Who can reckon up the good results of the influence produced by the university sermons of Dwight on the young men of Yale, or the very similar influence of the discourses of Arnold to his pupils at Rugby! All this is adapted to impress the mind with the immense responsibility involved in such services.

Along with this view, it is very proper to consider the peculiar facilities which preachers to such an audience have for the discharge of their duties. They are sure of their congregations beforehand; may know with definite certainty their number, their character, and hence need not draw their bow at a venture, or be hindered and perplexed throughout the whole time of preparation, for fear of such casualties as do so often keep away from the ordinary assemblies the very individuals for whose benefit they would choose out and press home the most appropriate truth. Much more on a common level of intelligence and mental training, are these university audiences, than we may expect to find elsewhere; thus enabling the evangelical instructor to have a common aim. The bond of sympathy is more strong, or at least is less hindered in its operation, than in promiscuously gathered assemblies. Their common circumstances of separation from home and family kindred, their own common aims and destinations, and their exposedness to similar dangers, all give advantages to him who would so address them as to win them to Christ, guard them from their insidious foes, and build them up in faith and holiness. Moreover, the preacher having before him the same audience from week to week, accustomed to the mental processes of proceeding from one point already secured, to another dependent on it, he can rely on what has been proved already, and without unduly presuming, can more effectually prosecute a series of mutually dependent topics.

Such being the facilities, the adventitious but reliable aids which preachers of university sermons enjoy, it deserves a moment's consideration, what are the qualities most requisite in such a preacher, and what should be his leading aim in the themes and the composition of his discourses? While all

preachers should be good men, evincing in their lives the sincerity of their utterances, and conforming their practice to their precepts, there are special reasons why he who leads the daily devotions, and on the Sabbath discourses from the pulpit to those who are continually in close contact with him—minute observers of all his daily life-history—should be most consistently a living epistle, known and read as thoroughly imbued with the gospel which he proclaims. Weighty reasons are obvious why no inconsistency should here be tolerated,—nothing incongruous with the main design be admitted to mar the symmetry of that truth which such an advocate is the channel of communicating. A warm and sympathizing heart, if sufficiently guarded and restrained from the weak drivell of a mawkish sentimentalism, will also be an advantage. The thorough mastery of his subjects, with a broad margin of both particular and general knowledge, beyond what is implied and required for the statement, the proof and the illustration of his themes, will also be of immense advantage here, from the peculiar character and habit of the minds to which he ministers. Young men of aspiring dispositions are not content to be fed out of a nearly exhausted measure. They very soon tire of, and lose respect for, a guide nearly as limited in knowledge as themselves, and seems on the point of self-exhaustion. Then, too, in the themes selected; while there will be ample space and verge enough for the most fertile invention, there is no need that this should be constantly on the rack for either novelties, or too exclusive a specialty. Let such an one, when sitting down to contemplate the need of those he is to address, remember first and chief of all, that they are a part of that fallen, depraved humanity, for every one of whom the one only Saviour lived and died. That for them, just as truly as for the rest of the race, there is salvation in no other. Hence in the general plan of these discourses, let it be the one chief aim to shut up the intelligent, inquisitive, ambitious youth to the prime indispensableness of counting all things loss and dross in comparison with the infinite blessedness of having Christ formed in them the hope of glory.

It has been the common verdict of those who have had largest experience in these things, that a common and greivous fault with those preaching to a particular class—as sailors, soldiers, prisoners, mechanics, merchants or professional men—is found in the attempt to laboriously adapt the subject or the treatment, or both, to the narrow specialty of each. There is a double infelicity in this; for the landsman in endeavoring to baptize his message into the nautical vocabulary of sailors, ordinarily mistakes and bungles in such a way as to win no admiration, but pity and contempt rather, for his verdant awkwardness. Or even if more successful in this respect, this very success, by fixing attention on itself, withdraws it from the weightier import of the theme, and thus becomes an embarrassing hindrance instead of an aid to the main design. Now this is all as true and as important to be remembered in addressing students as any other class. The common salvation and its immediate claims should stand forth in uncompromising clearness. So, also, as to the endeavor after, or the affectation of originality and the invention of novelties,—that prince of pulpit orators, Robert Hall, has pithily said, that to an honest man seeking advice in an important exigency, originality is about the last thing desirable. So, too, of abundant classical allusions and superfluous ornament, they will not aid but rather retard the religious effect of such discourses as we are now considering. The nervous style of Archbishop Whately is preferable to the elaborate antithesis, the sparkling glitter, and euphonic fulness of Macaulay.

Still there may be room and demand for some positive peculiarities in university sermons. Well chosen, strictly correct, and even sententious language, chastely beautiful, is here more important than in other pulpit performances. So logical accuracy of statement and reasoning, and a lucid, natural arrangement, which, without making too prominent the different parts and passages, the articulations and transitions of the discourse, shall yet show the beginning, the middle, and the end, and shall bring all parts and processes in the discussion to bear on the end, are here important. Hence erratic waywardness and spasmodic impulsiveness, will here

prove a blemish and a hindrance to the main design, more harmful by far than in a promiscuous audience where such episodes are sometimes the redeeming feature of the whole—the only thing attended to or remembered.

But it may be easier to evince our meaning in the concrete than the abstract form; and we turn to consider, as illustrations of what we would inculcate, the specimens of University preaching named at the head of this article. We have there arranged them in the chronological order of the editions before us. Let us begin our review of them, however, with the second on this list, for a two-fold reason; in the first place, Dr. Arnold's instructive lectures contemplate and commence with a somewhat earlier period of life than the other volumes here enumerated; and then again, he has thoughtfully wrought out a fuller and more complete system than either of the others has presented. The course of Sabbath discourses to his select assembly of two or three hundred students of the Rugby school, he has named "The Christian Life." Beginning with the ordinary status of youth in the transition period between childhood and manhood; his first sermon takes for its subject the consideration of our fallen humanity, as having come to know good and evil. The consciousness of evil within us and around us is the starting point. Next he considers the transitional period, calling for the putting away of childish things, on becoming men. In the close of lecture third, he thus answers the popular objection to youths becoming religious, because of its supposed incongruity with what is becoming to their age. We extract a paragraph here, not only as a specimen of the Doctor's manner, but for its intrinsic value. For such objections are widely prevalent. If not spoken out, they are thought and felt, and sadly influential, not only with inconsiderate youth themselves, but with their more inexcusable parents and seniors also.

"There may remain, however, a vague notion that, generally, if what we mean by an early change from childishness to manliness be that we should become religious, then, although it may not exhaust the powers, or injure the health, yet it would destroy the natural liveliness and gaiety of youth, would be unbecoming and ridiculous. Now, in the first place, there is a great deal

of confusion and a great deal of folly in the common notions of the gaiety of youth. If gaiety mean real happiness of mind, I do not believe that there is more of it in youth than in manhood; if for this reason only, that the temper in youth being commonly not yet brought into order, irritation and passion are felt, probably, oftener than in after life, and these are sad drawbacks, as we all know, to a real cheerfulness of mind. And of the outward gaiety of youth, there is a part also which is like the gaiety of a drunken man; which is riotous, insolent, and annoying to others; which, in short, is a folly and a sin. There remains that which strictly belongs to youth, partly physical—the lighter step and the lovelier movement of the growing and vigorous body; partly from circumstances, because a young person's parents or friends stand between him and many of the cares of life, and protect him from feeling them altogether; partly from the abundance of hope which belongs to the beginning of everything, and which continually hinders the mind from dwelling on past pain. And I know not which of these causes of gaiety would be taken away or lessened by the earlier change from childhood to manhood. True it is, that the question, "What must I do to be saved?" is a grave one, and must be considered seriously; but I do not suppose that any one proposes that a young person should never be serious at all. True it is, again, that if we are living in folly and sin, this question may be a painful one; we might be gayer for a time without it. But, then, the matter is, what is to become of us if we do not think of being saved?—shall we be saved without thinking of it? And what is it to be not saved but lost? I cannot pretend to say that the thought of God would not very much disturb the peace and gaiety of an ungodly and sinful mind; that it would not interfere with the mirth of the bully, or the drunkard, or the reveller, or the glutton, or the idler, or the fool. It would, no doubt; just as the hand that was seen to write on the wall threw a gloom over the guests of Belshazzar's festival. I never meant or mean to say, that the thought of God, or that God himself, can be other than a plague to those who do not love Him. The thought of Him is their plague here; the sight of Him will be their judgment for ever. But I suppose the point is, whether the thought of Him would cloud the gaiety of those who were striving to please Him? It would cloud it as much, and be just as unwelcome, and no more, as will be the very actual presence of our Lord to the righteous, when they shall see Him as He is. Can that which we know to be able to make old age, and sickness and poverty, many times full of comfort—can that make youth and health gloomy? When to natural cheerfulness and sanguineness, are added a consciousness of God's ever present care, and a knowledge of his rich promises, are we likely to be the more sad or the more unhappy? What reason, then, is there for any one's not anticipating the common progress of Christian manliness, and hastening to exchange, as I said before, ignorance for wisdom, selfishness for unselfishness, carelessness for thoughtfulness? I see no reason why we should not; but is there no reason why we should? You are young, and, for the most part, strong and healthy; I grant that, humanly speaking, the chances of early death to any particular person among you are small. But still, considering what life is, even to the youngest and strongest, it does seem a fearful risk to be living unredeemed; to be living in that state, that if we should happen to die (it may be very unlikely, but still it is clearly

possible) we should be most certainly lost for ever. Risks, however, we do not mind; the chances, we think, are in our favor, and we will run the hazard. It may be so; but he who delays to turn to God when the thought has been once put before him, is incurring something more than a risk. He may not die these fifty or sixty years; we cannot tell how that may be; but he is certainly at this very present time hardening his heart, and doing despite unto the Spirit of Grace. By the very wickedness of putting off turning to God till a future time, he lessens his power of turning to Him ever. This is certain; no one can reject God's call without becoming less likely to hear it when it is made to him again. And thus the lingering wilfully in the evil things of childhood, when he might be at work in putting them off, and when God calls us to do so, is an infinite risk, and a certain evil; an infinite risk, for it is living in such a state that death at any moment would be certain condemnation; and a certain evil, because, whether we live or not, we are actually raising up barriers between ourselves and our salvation; we not only do not draw nigh to God, but we are going farther from Him, and lessening our power of drawing nigh to Him hereafter."

Following up, in the two following lectures, the necessity of welcoming religious knowledge in youth, in order thereby to form a truly Christian character; and deploring the common indifference to it, he notices with proper sorrow the increasing prevalence of a taste for exciting fiction, its wide distribution by serial tales and light literature generally, just adapted to surfeit the young mind by its unwholesome sweets, and prevent a healthy relish for what is infinitely more important.

Going onward he comes to consider the state of moral impotence when one becomes awakened to a full sense of his inability, so that he cannot do the things which he would, which both conscience and scripture demand of him. And in just this painful condition there comes to his aid the proffer — to those who prayerfully, perseveringly seek it — of the Spirit to help our infirmity. Hence the utter inexcusableness of all to whom the gospel comes, if they do not have the Spirit, and walking in it, do not escape that living after the flesh, whose sure end is destruction. Then comes the duty, enforced by a most solemn divine injunction, to take up our cross daily and dare to be singular, if we would truly follow Christ.

Then follows this closing appeal:

"What is to be said to this? This is God's judgment, this is Christ's word; and we cannot, dare not, qualify it. They are evil, for God and Christ declare it, who judge and live after the maxims of the society around them, and not af-

ter Christ; they are evil who are careless; they are evil who live according to their own blind and capricious feelings, now hot, now cold; they are evil who call evil good and good evil, because they have not known the Father nor Christ. This and nothing less we say, lest we should be found false witnesses of God. But if this language, which is that of Scripture, seem harsh to any one, oh! let him remember how soon he may change it into language of the most abundant mercy, of the tenderest love; that if he calls upon God, God is ready to hear; that if he seeks to know and to do God's will, God will be found by him, and will strengthen him; that it is true kindness not to disguise from him his real danger, but earnestly to conjure him to flee from it, and to offer our humblest prayers to God for him and for ourselves, that our judgments and our practice may be found only after his example."

Then follow, in the following order, these several topics: The uses of the divine law; The solemn warning of a time coming when we may seek God in vain; The aspect of one not far from the kingdom, and how differently such an one may appear, viewed from different points, above him or below him — before or behind him; The case of those called but not chosen; then The case of ingenuous and comparatively innocent youth, with hearts destitute of the love of God, like the house empty, swept and garnished; The practice of the majority no sure guide; and The lack of energy in our religious concerns; Inequality of religious advantages a lesson and stimulus to vigorous application, so that the last may be first; and Whosoever worships Christ truly, has eternal life.

We have thus summarily run over the first half of the earliest of these volumes on the Christian life. The subjects, rather than the texts are given, as not unfrequently these last seem infelicitously chosen, taken in some instances from the Scripture lessons for the day, which of course were fixed by the Canon without reference to the exigencies of his congregation. The preacher so far defers to the liturgy as to take his text, but not his theme of discourse from the lesson. Take as an instance the xxxviiith Lecture of the first volume. The text is "Isaiah v: 1: Now will I sing unto my well beloved a song of my beloved, touching his vineyard." The doctrine of the discourse is, that the Church of Christ consists not of the clergy only. This doctrine is true and important, but alas! what foundation of it can be found in that text. Similar instances occur in many places. We cannot but regard it

a blemish, and a great fault. So is the frequent introduction of the infant sprinkling—miscalled *baptism*—which, in the altogether unscriptural use and reliance upon it, has led on to baptismal regeneration instead of being born of the Spirit as the beginning of the Christian life. But with these and some other affiliated faults, there are so many great and redeeming excellencies of adaptedness to the wants of young men that it may well be doubted whether elsewhere a similar amount of valuable homiletic instruction, for just that class, can be found. How perfectly correct, for instance, are his remarks in the XXVth Lecture, on forms of prayer.

We quote a few lines :

“How can we get Him (the Lord) to visit us ? There is one answer — by prayer and watchfulness. By prayer, whether we are in our preparatory state or our fixed one ; by prayer, and I think I may add, by praying in our own words. Of course, when we pray together, some of us must join in the words of others ; and it makes little difference whether those words be spoken or read. But when we pray alone, some perhaps may use none but prayers made by others, especially the Lord's Prayer. We should remember, however that the Lord's prayer was given for this very purpose, to teach us how to pray for ourselves. But it does not do this if we use it alone, and still more if we use it without understanding it. If we do understand it, and study it, it will indeed teach us to pray ; it will show us what we most need in prayer, and what are our greatest evils ; but surely it may be said that no man ever learnt this lesson well without wishing to practise it ; no man ever used the Lord's prayer with understanding and with earnestness, without adding to it others of his own.”

In volume second the three consecutive Lectures on Christian Schools, that on Education and Instruction, and those on Christian Exertion, on Christian Fasting, on Repentance, on Conscience, and on Responsibility, are real models of their kind. The simple, unambitious character of the lectures, both in the themes chosen, and in their discussion, is one of their best and most useful features. It would be no marvel if some readers who have heard much of the great Dr. Arnold, the writer of many books, and the renowned conductor of one of the most important schools for young men of the highest ranks in England, should experience some disappointment in taking up these volumes, and reading a sermon here and there, without much regard to its special aim and adaptedness,

as a part of a well considered series. There may not, even in the end, be found much brilliancy, or any uncommon depth; but there will be found much well considered fitness to the high and blessed end in view, leading these youth to Christ, and building them up in faith and manly virtue.

Dr. Wayland and his writings need no introduction to our readers. Confessedly one of the master minds in our American Israel, he is characterized by strong thoughts and lucid utterance. As tutor and professor in one of our principal American colleges in early life, and subsequently for nearly an ordinary lifetime the President of the venerable University at Providence, he knows young men by this long and intimate intercourse as very few have the opportunity of knowing, and the highest expectations are naturally awakened by a volume from his hand, culled out of the sermons which he has delivered to this interesting class of hearers. Twenty-one discourses are embraced in this publication, the first three-fourths of which pertain to the common salvation. Of the later ones three are on obedience to the civil magistrate, and two on the *then* Recent Revolutions in Europe. At present we have to do only with the earlier portion of the volume, and it will be found eminently worthy of careful study in its adaptedness to the topic of present consideration.

The first sixteen sermons have the following titles: Atheism, Theoretical and Practical; The Moral Character of Man; The Fall of Man; Justification by Works impossible; Preparation for the Advent of the Messiah; Work of the Messiah; Justification by Faith; A Day in the Life of Jesus of Nazareth; The Fall of Peter; The Church of Christ; and Unity of the Church of Christ.

The discourses are imbued with a noble Catholic spirit,*

* In what other institution in our country could there be found a more true liberality than the President of Brown University evinces, when, in his sermon on the Church of Christ, he thus declares his sentiments and his practice. "I speak here as the advocate of no sect, but as I believe, in the Spirit of Universal Christianity. In addressing you, young gentlemen, I am of no sect. Never since I have been an instructor, have I uttered a word with the conscious intention of proselyting you to the denomination of which I am a

and can scarcely fail, wherever read understandingly to promote the intelligence, the devout zeal, and the spirituality of the readers. The learned doctor is fond of original speculation. He dearly loves to analyze what to other minds may seem simple and elementary, and his own habits of thought and philosophizing may have unconsciously led him in some few instances to a depth and abstruseness of reasoning, into which the young minds of undergraduates would scarcely follow him. We have understood, indeed, that these assemblies in the University Chapel were often made up very largely of the elite of the educated and devout men and women of the city, quite as much as of students. Hence, very probably, the scope and method of many of the sermons. The only serious objection which we have heard offered to these discourses, is the lack of sufficient simplicity in the subjective presentation of Christ as the direct and only hope of perishing sinners. It is not doubted that Dr. Wayland cordially believes in this. Evidence enough may be gathered even from this volume to convince any one that such is the

member. I have no right to use what little influence I may possess as an instructor for such a purpose. You have all your own religious preferences, as you are connected with the different persuasions of Protestant Christianity. We would have you enjoy these preferences to the uttermost, and in this institution you have, from the beginning, enjoyed them to the uttermost, not as a favor, but as an inalienable right. We would say to you all, Search the Scriptures each one for himself, and by the exercise of your own understandings, ascertain what is the truth which Jesus Christ has revealed to us. Having done this, unite yourselves, if you have not yet done it, to that sect whose belief and practice seem most in harmony with the teachings of the holy oracle. Understand what you profess, and be always ready, as intelligent men, to give to others a reason of your faith. But guard yourselves against the notion that your sect is, in any exclusive sense, the Church of Christ, or that in any special sense it embodies the heirs of heaven or the favorites of God. Reverence and love and imitate real piety wherever you may find it. Your great distinction is, not that you are a member of this or that sect, but that you are a child of God, and an humble, self-denying disciple of the blessed Saviour." This is real Rhode Island doctrine and practice. It belongs to the era and the region of Roger Williams, and soul-freedom. This, too, it seems to us is the proper course for all University Sermons in this country, where students are gathered from all the multitudinous sects to be trained in common. In such liberty and freedom there may be perfect union.

author's full and deep conviction. Perhaps, after all, the defect, if there be one, is more in manner than in matter, and not unlikely the gifted author would now somewhat more warmly and directly press upon the conscience and the heart of his hearers the infinite urgency—not merely that Christ should be conceived of rightly as an almighty and adequate Saviour,* but specially that He should be formed in each one of them the hope of glory, than he did fifteen or twenty years ago, when these sermons were delivered. That kind of philosophical dissection to which his daily duties in the class room accustomed him, handling the abstruse and metaphysical subjects connected with our mental and moral natures, and their various recondite phenomena, may have insensibly led him more to speculation in preaching than he would now think altogether the most profitable for the ardent and often impatient minds of average young men in student-life. Such may, perhaps, seem some of his speculations in the second sermon, on the Work of the Messiah, where several pages are devoted to a consideration of what the Redeemer may have done for us in his grand propitiation, between the time of his death and his resurrection, of which, as the Dr. admits, the Scriptures have not informed us. Something of the same character may be found in the next sermon on Justification by Faith, where a long discussion occurs as to the nature of faith, leading to this summary enunciation :

“Faith is the exercise of filial love, successfully resisting the pressure of things present, sensual and unholy. It is acting as God would have us, not when all things incite us to obedience, but when all things around us incite us to sin. It is the temper of mind which thus gives to things unseen

* The characteristic excellence of Dr. Wayland as a teacher and writer, strongly biasses him to the objective presentation of whatever can be grasped and handled; can be viewed in different lights and analyzed into its component parts; can be logically stated and fully explained. Nor is it any marvel, or on the whole to be regretted, perhaps, since all excellencies cannot be found in any one, that with a habitual horror of anything approaching to mysticism, he less considers and insists on the other or subjective view of the reception of Christ, and his incorporation into the believer so as to be mysteriously but truly one with him.

their appropriate mastery over things seen; it is the overcoming of the world by the power of holy trust in God, reliance upon his perfections, when every dictate of human wisdom would lead us to distrust Him."

Now this is sufficiently comprehensive for a definition; but is it not confused also, grouping together faith and its fruits or results, as well as its concomitants? Further on in the same discourse, remarking upon the Apostle's enumeration of examples of faith in the patriarchs, as stated in the xith of Hebrews, he says: "It is not necessary to suppose that they were persons of real piety, though they may have been really pious." This sounds strangely to our ears, accustomed as we have always been to regard the exercise of true faith as of itself the best evidence of piety: specially a faith so comprehensive as Dr. Wayland above defines it. Then as to the office of faith in our justification, the Doctor thus teaches: "The very disposition, on account of which we are justified, insures by necessary consequence that change of character without which we could never be acceptable to God." If we mistake not, the wrong of this is that it founds our justification on the manner of our believing, and not on the object of our faith—Christ only. It turns the eye of the anxious inquirer inward upon himself, and makes him over-scrupulous about some qualification in his own bosom: when his whole duty is to look away from himself to Christ, the only Saviour. What if the bitten Israelite in the wilderness had been lectured for half an hour on the nature and concomitants of right-looking to the brazen serpent, and in the midst of the learned homily had died! Were it not better, then as now, to urge every bitten and dying sufferer at once to look, as bidden, to the source of healing?

There are, indeed, delightful exceptions to this untimely philosophizing, in these discourses. We have to read, again and again, the simple pathos of "A Day in the Life of Jesus," and "The Fall of Peter." Nothing can be farther from these, and some others among these sermons, than any undue abstruseness. They show us how a great mind, accustomed to verse itself in the deep things of God, of man, and of eter-

nity, can unbend, and in its simply sublime utterances, can allure and melt and bless us by an artless simplicity, as rare as it is beautiful. More of such preaching, we are confident and less of Systematic Theology in its profounder depths, would better subserve the religious welfare of young students in the important years of college life.

Dr. Huntington's connection with Harvard University as chaplain and preacher—if we have been correctly informed—proved a turning point in his theology, both theoretically and practically. He was selected for the place by the Unitarian President and Fellows of that institution, as one who probably approached nearer to what are reckoned evangelical sentiments, than most of his liberal associates. While there fulfilling his official duties, and ministering to the spiritual wants of the young men under his pastoral care—whether from the conviction of their need of something higher and deeper than Liberalism furnished, or from his own wants, or from continued study of the sacred Scriptures, or from all combined—he became not only almost, but altogether orthodox, both in creed and in the messages of divine truth which he ministered to others. The sermons here published, called “Christian Believing and Living,” were selected probably from the more evangelical kind, which he had delivered in the University Chapel. While not Unitarian at all, so far as we can discover, they do not indicate such extreme views as one just breaking away from fundamental errors long held and defended, might naturally be expected to set forth. For, too often the weakness of human nature shows itself by oscillating, like the pendulum, far across the perpendicular line from one point of departure to the opposite extreme. Happily for him, and for those committed to his spiritual charge, he has been preserved from this common error; and in these sermons evinces a wise adaptation to win over to sounder views those who before had been little favorable to them. They are not controversial, but eminently practical. Still, if one would be convinced of the wide difference between real Unitarianism, and evangelical instruction, he may readily find the difference by comparing the scope and general spirit of this volume with that which fol-

lows it, from President Horace Mann. In regard to Christ, and his relations to us, the office and power of faith, the doctrine of spiritual influence, the Trinity and its involvement of important practical truth, there will be found in these discourses of Dr. Huntington an unexpected clearness and fulness of development, most gratifying and satisfactory. Undoubtedly one in just his situation would enjoy certain advantages from his past position and connections, in knowing just what light is most needful, and where help and counsel may most avail in leading the novice in religious inquiry from the region of doubt, negation, and unsubstantial shadows, to the full appreciation of a divine Redeemer, to be welcomed by our faith, and henceforth to be formed in and to abide with us, the hope of life everlasting. But while availing himself of this personal advantage, there is really no egotism in his development of truth, no boastful assumption that the preacher had been in error but now has emerged to the light, and therefore must be a competent guide for the inquirer to follow. More is often lost than gained by any such personal episodes; and his peculiar case and position, surrounded by the President and other older Unitarian clergymen than himself, they would have been peculiarly infelicitous and offensive.

At the same time, there is a delightful fulness and richness in Dr. Huntington's discussion of some of his well chosen themes, which will gladden many a soul hungering for the unction of evangelical truth, in its varied adaptedness to the experience of disciples in the school of Jesus. He does not, as much as many preachers in University Halls, seek after novelties, or affect unusual originality. At the same time, the sincere milk of the word is communicated with vigorous earnestness, sufficiently ornate for one who would be fed rather than amused. Specially will it be noticed how full is the disclosure of the subjective life that springs from the indwelling Saviour. The following extract, from the second Sermon, illustrates this:

"Christ did not come to show us how a human existence can be moulded, and the world's evils be vanquished, by a resolute self-will. It is amazing

with what a barren notion of "Christ, the Example," some Christian readers have been satisfied; as if the Son of God had stood apart from the vital seats of motive power, the springs of love and faith in men, and only exhibited to the eye of admiration an external model of excellence, which his followers were to set themselves, with cool faculties, to copy. The highest spiritual works are not accomplished in that way. Exemplary virtue is never the loftiest virtue. Imitation of any model, however high, is not the noblest action of the soul. Influence, as the very etymology of the word might teach, is another thing from that. All our best helps are spiritual gifts or forces from soul to soul. Christ came to be a divine personal influence in the world; i. e., that in and through his Person the Divine life might virtually and literally flow into the breasts of mankind. He came not to tell us the manner of living, but to communicate, to pour in, upon all willing and receiving hearts, the power of living—the energy that acts itself spontaneously into holy thoughts and deeds. To that end the Divine and the human elements are perfectly blended in him. He is the Divine Humanity in Jesus of Nazareth; the Word from the beginning; the 'Man of Sorrows,' and 'before Abraham was;' Son of Mary, and Son of God. This constitutes a mediator. In order that God might gain that love and that trust; in order that man might lay hold of Him in a personal 'way, and truth, and life,' in a Saviour made in all points like himself, and even tempted as he is—the Father was manifested in the Son. The world's poor, aching heart longed to see and to feel that heavenly compassion, that Divine goodness; and it came. Bethlehem and Calvary were the answer to that want. And so, Christendom over, wherever Christ has been most personally revered, and loved, and clung to, and sung and celebrated, and followed, there his religion has had its most positive planting, and exercised its most effectual control. So, it is said, his true disciples are 'partakers' of his life; whoso 'receiveth' him—not heareth him merely, or looketh on him, but 'receiveth' him — 'hath life eternal.' We are to eat his flesh, and drink his blood, the strong, true figure says. He is to be formed within us. He gives Himself. This comports with the purest and simplest philosophy of the spiritual nature. Surely, if Christ merely set himself up as a pattern of human virtue to be imitated, he did not understand himself, nor his work. Then he could not have said, 'As I live by the Father, so ye shall live by me'; 'I in them, and Thou, Father, in me, that all may be made perfect in one.'"

We must be allowed a still longer and fuller exhibition of the views which this volume presents on that mooted and much misunderstood doctrine—the Trinity. The twentieth sermon in this series, entitled "Life, Salvation and Comfort for Man in the Divine Trinity," without being in the bad sense of the word controversial, does give, nevertheless, a fullness of instruction and earnestness of appeal as to the practical influence of this doctrine, which may well challenge the serious and devout consideration of every candidate for immortality. The preacher has given, in a long note, and still longer addenda,

the thoughts on this subject of another living American divine—Dr. Bushnell—whom the Unitarians, not long since, were fond of claiming as substantially in agreement with themselves. This discourse, thus enlarged, is the longest in the book, extending to over sixty pages. We should gladly give a full analysis of it, but must content ourselves with an extract of two or three paragraphs.

“In any really deep Christian experience, the great feeling of need, the energy of repentance, the agony of conviction, connects itself with a conscious estrangement from the Heavenly Father, through a violation of his holy and merciful law; not merely a single act of sin; not merely a series of such acts; but a state of the nature and a habit of the life ungratefully and wickedly separated from God. Of course, so long as there is a feeble or lax sense of God's holiness, of the sanctity of his requirements, and of the exceeding height and breadth and length of His commandments, and of the wide-spread mischief and unutterable wrong even of a single infraction of it, sending its jar of discord through the spiritual world and directly offending such a being as God is, so long this piercing and bitter conviction will not be realized. Some lighter and easier solution than the Cross, therefore, will satisfy the mind, or seem to satisfy it, till a deeper movement agitates the heart, and breaks up its inmost fountains. Whenever that hour comes, there comes with it a cry for full redemption, such a redemption as only the suffering of Him who is both man and God can give. The different theories of Christ's nature and sacrifice appear, and pass before the stricken and self-condemned soul. Is Christ a consistent man only; a brave martyr; a glorious instance of a well-finished career, meeting an inevitable death with exemplary firmness? But what is that to a sorrow and remorse like this? However animating to other moods, after the alienated conscience is reconciled, and knows that its condemnation is blotted out, such an example can now be only an aggravating and unattainable vision, mocking the disabled and disordered will. Besides, however blameless and disinterested the death of Jesus may be, if we speak of human firmness or courage, these have been apparently equaled, as has often been noticed, by other sufferers. The scenes of Gethsemane and Calvary have been surpassed in the mere quality of silent, human endurance, more than once. On the humanitarian hypothesis, the tears and prayers and groans and shrinkings of the ‘Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world,’ sink to an inferior place in the victories of fortitude. It is only as we find there the nameless and inexpressible anguish of a Divine and Infinite Being, bearing the iniquities of us all, and purposely taking up all the tenderest sensibilities of our ordinary frame, in the benevolent mystery of the Incarnation, that the signals of the Passion are lifted into any genuine honor. Without this, they are less than they assume to be, and fail even of respect. Nor is the grand want supplied by supposing the Saviour to be exalted into some superhuman dignity of endowment, yet remaining only a creature and a subject. Subject he certainly was in his mediatorial and earthly office. But the union of the two natures was real,

organic, not apparent only, not dramatic, nor mechanical: so that when the Saviour suffered, God suffered. God did not perish; how strange and sad that the thoughtless perversions or wilful misrepresentations of hostile theologians should have ever made such a statement necessary. But when the mortal part of the Saviour died, God suffered in him. The shedding of the blood of such a body was more than a human sacrifice. The sundering of that eternal life-principle from that sacred flesh was a divine death. This is what faith means, when, rising into its unquestioning joy, and breaking forth into lyrical thanksgiving, it sings its holy hymns of praise to a 'dying God.' He died as man, who also liveth ever as God. And in that dying, by the intimate and transcendent sympathies of the Divine and the human in him — incomprehensible indeed, but just as truly comprehensible as any creative act of the Infinite — there was involved God's anguish for his sinning children, and his free sacrifice for the broken law. The sacrifice was not confined to the ninth hour. It was in the Garden; it was on the heavy journey thence to Calvary. It began to be manifest even at the supper and the judgment hall. It was consummated at the cross; for 'without the shedding of blood,' there could be 'no remission of sin.'

"And now this is precisely what an inferior faith fails to gain. Raise your conception of Christ's rank in the scale of created being high as you may; carry it to the mark of Ebion and Arius; assign the point of Christ's beginning at whatever period in time you will; still both practically and logically the needed atonement fails. The eternal Lawgiver is not bearing the disinterested pain and wondrous penalty for all his creatures 'in that all have sinned.' God is not Himself in the suffering. This was the requirement of the case. This was the longing of the guilty heart. This is what the Gospel, from end to end, in plain and full and glorious language, declares. Read it again, and see how in the interpretation of this principle all becomes consistent and simple; all occasion for forced explanation and abatement ceases: all the strong and earnest speech is luminous with meaning and abounding in comfort. It is not meant that the understanding, in the presence of a work so vast and a goodness so august, should be able to describe every part of the wonder, and put in place every element of the redemptive power. But enlightened by the Holy Spirit, which delights to teach and satisfy so docile a mind, it does seize enough to cling to, and cheerfully hands over the remaining marvel to a Christian trust. And trust gladly accepts the charge. The soul is free. Conscience is at the same moment released, and roused to an unprecedented and sanctified activity. Duty never looked so dear. Obedience was never so eager. Practical righteousness was never so noble, because never animated by so grand a motive. 'The cross' has now no accommodated, strained, perplexing signification; but its entire evangelical force rings clearly and directly on the inmost sense of faith. And underneath is a peace, which, as they that have found it humbly testify, differs from all the consolations ever felt before, and surpasses them all, as the love of God in Christ passes the love of man." [In epitome. here is another development.]

"It is as if the Father said, 'All else has been done; I have created, guarded, guided, supported, blessed, foreborne; Providence and revelation in nature and in the inspired oracles of Moses and the prophets, have exhausted their possi-

bilities. Lo! one mercy more; the last and mightiest. I can suffer for my children; I can come in the flesh; I can be one of them. In that incarnation I can ache, and weep, and sorrow for them and with them; all their stripes can be laid upon me. All their infirmities can cling to me. I can die as they die—the last of the evils they dread—the penalty of the broken law. This shall both move and release them. This shall be the regeneration and the redemption of all mankind who will believe it.' O, Infinite compassion! Herein is love! This is the 'mystery hid from the foundation of the world.' The Holy Spirit ever comes, from the Father and the Son, to make the whole work effectual for the Church and the heart. We behold, we begin at least to behold, why God is forever ONE—is forever THREE."

Of the sermons, so called, of the Hon. Horace Mann (we are not aware that he ever entered the Christian Ministry, and hence the prefix "Rev." is never attached to his name), we find it somewhat difficult, from personal kindness, to say all which a thorough, faithful review would seem to demand. He was with us, a beloved fellow student and tutor, in our *Alma Mater*, and has now recently passed away from earth, much regretted and lauded. In the years which he so vigorously devoted to the improvement of common school education in the old Bay State, we co-operated with and honored him. His eloquent lectures of a popular character, at the same time in favor of temperance and moral purity, we listened to with satisfaction, deeming them spirit-stirring and effective in a high degree. Fondly had we hoped that when, removed from the head-quarters of Unitarianism, he had taken his place as President of a college in the great State of Ohio, he would have become less of the religious partizan, and have risen to a worthier elevation. Some allowance should doubtless be made for his constitutional temperament, for the ardor of his mind, and the lack of control in the use of his fiery rhetoric, which was, from our earliest knowledge of him, both constitutional and habitual. His controversy with the teachers of the public schools in Boston, gave damaging proof of the proclivity. Still we were not prepared for such sneers at the plain teaching of Christ as abound in these sermons. We can afford space but for a few specimens. In regard to the existence of the devil for instance, such statements as these abound:

"We all of us have devils enough in our own hearts to make the office of any other devil a sinecure."

"The imagination of man has led him to personify temptation, to regard it as an evil agency, external to ourselves, to embody it and call it a devil."

"But then the devil or evil (for it makes not a pin's difference practically, whether we affix the 'd' or omit it.)"—

We will not stop to argue the point, which all who revere Christ's authority must admit, that if his testimony on any subject is to be taken, then the existence and agency of this enemy of all righteousness, must be soberly believed, all the sneers of neology to the contrary notwithstanding.

So, and for apparently the same reason, the Holy Ghost is read out of existence or influence in the same summary manner. Speaking of the prodigal, in one of these sermons, he says :

"There was no unholy ghost that made him sin ; there was no Holy Ghost that made him repent."

No substitutionary or mediatorial influence will he allow in man's recovery from ruin. In regard to this same prodigal he asks :

"If he himself did not recover himself, why was he rewarded with all parental endearments? On the supposition that he himself did not [unassisted] rise, the swine themselves might have been thus feasted, with as much propriety, as he."

So his sneers at the new or second birth, and at the needlessness of missionaries for the heathen, are not welcome to those who revere our Lord's teaching to Nicodemus, and his final commission.

The case of the Cawline Islanders, who believe that their entering heaven depends on the gladiatorial or pugilistic skill of friendly or adverse divinities, he adduces as an illustration of the absurdity of the Christian reliance on the substitutionary obedience, and sufferings and advocacy of Christ for us; "the subterfuge of substitution," as he expressly calls it. And again, "Christ died to save sinners, not by substituting his sufferings for theirs—he was too wise and far-seeing for such folly as that,—but by his example of fidelity to truth."

How little in harmony these sarcasms are with a petition in one of his prayers given in this volume, "that we may never visit with revilings any one of the human race, because

he does not see as we see," was not so obvious to Mr. Mann, we presume, as it must be to his readers. He would not, we are sure, burn Calvin with literal fire, for his supposed acquiescence in the persecution of Servetus; but he has over and over again impaled him alive on the barbed forks of his rhetorical execration.

The more than half willing assent which he seems to give to the infidel assumption of a few ethnologists, of a diversity in the origin of the human race, is of the same misleading character. His last discourse is on miracles—Christ's Miracles—and is a specimen of ingenious and mischievous sophistry. Without affirming or denying the truth of Christ's miracles, and overlooking entirely their declared import and design to prove his Messiahship, that men might see and believe on him as the God-sent Saviour—the sermon is an elaborate attempt to show that Dr. Howe, and Dr. Woodward, and Miss Dix work miracles as truly as Christ! O the miserable depth to which degrading the Saviour of the world to low humanitarianism, and exalting poor worms of earth to a kind of equality with him whom all heaven adores, has led even Horace Mann!

There is in these sermons much eloquence and ingenuity, and on some moral topics a worthy and noble vehemence. We had marked for transfer to our pages two extracts, one on the most formidable attribute of temptation, pp. 184–185, and several good arguments for the immortality of the soul, 265 and following pages; but we cannot command room for them.

For the same reasons we must dismiss the sermons of President Walker with inadequate examination. We have read most of them with pleasure, finding much to commend, and little to censure. Considering their source, we have been surprised at the amount of sound ethical and religious instruction which they embody, and at their careful avoidance of such utterances as might give offence to orthodox ears. Except in the affirmation of the native purity of mankind as the successive generations come into the world, there is scarcely a declaration in which the orthodox might not coincide. True,

there is a wide difference between the manner in which Drs. Arnold and Wayland and Huntington would treat "the Mediator," and the first sermon in this volume on that very subject. But Dr. Walker's is only the sin of omission, and he says many noble and true things of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, and of man's infinite need. His style is a model of terseness and purity, sometimes rising almost to beauty. The volume may be read with profit by all classes, and by students especially.

ARTICLE V.—THE PENALTY OF SIN.

[BY REV. S. R. MASON, CAMBRIDGEPORT, MASS.]

WE propose to consider the question : "What is the penalty of sin for man in the Government of God ?"

Penalty has been defined to be "the suffering in person or property, which is annexed by law or judicial decision to the commission of a crime, offence, or trespass, as a punishment." The limitation, "by law or judicial decision," is essential to the correctness of the definition. Sufferings which are not inflicted by law, or judicial decision, are not penalty. It would, perhaps, express more accurately the relation of penalty to law to say, that it is the suffering which is threatened by the law itself, in its penal clause, as the punishment of him who transgresses it. When penalty is inflicted upon the transgressor of any law, it is just that which is thus threatened, and nothing else, judicially visited upon him.

Nothing can be properly named penalty which is not contained in this penal clause of the law, prescribing what shall be the punishment for its transgression. Other evils may be

suffered by the transgressor as consequences of his transgression. Inflicted penalty may, also, involve him who suffers it, in a long train of evil consequences from which he can by no means escape. But unless these consequences, whether of transgression or of inflicted penalty, enter into the publication of the law as its penal sanction, and are inflicted by judicial decree, they cannot, in any proper sense of the term, be called penalty. They are only consequences. For example: if a man commits murder in this Commonwealth, the only thing which the law that forbids murder carries with it in its publication, as a penal threatening, is death—"that intrusive reminiscence of more barbarous times," according to the quiet and very positive assumption of our progressive Chief Magistrate. Whatever else the murderer may suffer as the consequence of his crime, if he does not suffer death by a judicial sentence, the penalty of his crime is not inflicted upon him. Pangs of conscience, days of anxiety and nights of terror, disgrace to himself and his family, imprisonment and impoverishment, none of these enter into his penalty, though they are consequences, some of them of his crime, others of his being accused of crime. Again; one who commits forgery may suffer disgrace, may see his family ruined, his prospects in business hopelessly blighted, his property wasted; not as the immediate consequences of his crime, but of the penalty which the law threatens as the punishment of the forger, and which is inflicted upon him by judicial authority. His confinement to hard labor in the State Prison, this, and nothing else, is the penalty of his crime.

Such is penalty, regarded in its relation to law. It is found to be the same when we look at it in its relation to pardon. Pardon, in any given instance, is an exact and full measure of all the decreed penalty that has not been executed upon the transgressor at the time when his pardon takes effect. In the case of the condemned murderer, if executive clemency reaches him in the form of pardon, it simply removes from him the sentence of death. It does nothing more. It removes not one other consequence of his crime. And so, if pardon is extended to the forger, who has been convicted and

sentenced for his crime, and is already suffering his punishment, it simply opens his prison door, and bids him go free, without suffering the remainder of his sentence. Not one of the many evils that his penalty has dragged in its train of consequences is removed by his pardon. It does not restore to him, nor to his family, the honor and respect which a convict's doom wrenched from them; it does not bring back his ruined business nor his wasted property. If he ever regains these he regains them through some other instrumentality than that of pardon. This has taken off from him that, and only that, which was made his punishment by the penal clause of the law which he transgressed.

Penalty is thus limited, whatever be the law for whose violation it is the punishment. All law, to be law, must be sustained by penal sanctions; and these, to be of effect, must be announced with the law itself in its publication. They are penalty only as they are sanctions, and they are sanctions only as they go forth in the publication of the law to deter those who are subject to it from transgression. We are brought, then, to this conclusion regarding the penalty of sin for man in the government of God; that it is just what the law of God, by its penal clause, announced to man as his punishment if he should transgress. The penal clause in the law of God, like the penal clause in any other law, is properly a judicial threatening of punishment to deter those to whom it is given from transgression, and to uphold the authority. To decide what the penalty of sin is, we have, therefore, only to look at the penal clause of the law of God in the only announcement of it which was ever made to men who had not already sinned. To these only could the penal clause be intended as a deterring threat. To such as have sinned it is the measure of the punishment to which they are already doomed.

We must go back, then, to God's dealings with sinless man, to find by what legal threatening he enforced upon him the authority of his law to deter him from transgressing it. The only instance on record of such dealing is that wherein God forbade the first, and only sinless man, to eat of "the

fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." This was an announcement of divine law. The history of the transaction, and other portions of the Scriptures, make it out clearly to have been the formal publishing of the law of God to man. We know not how fully the Lawgiver, in his dealings with Adam, explained the law in its bearings upon moral beings, and upon their relations to each other, and to himself. But this much is clear, that God invested this single prohibition with all his authority. The whole of the Divine law, so far as the authority of God was concerned, was summed up in these simple words: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it." This brought the whole of God's authority upon man, and reduced all questions touching the relation which he was to sustain to his Creator to this: whether or not he would be governed by his authority. The prohibition which narrowed the case down to this point, and was thus invested with all the authority of God, was itself the law of God.

Now, what was threatened as the punishment for transgressing this law? For if we examine the prohibition we see that it has its penal clause, a threatening of punishment to deter from transgression. The thing threatened was simply and only DEATH. The only penal clause that went with the law, when it was given, and none was ever added afterward, to deter sinless men from sinning, was this: "for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Nothing else was named as a consequence or a punishment. This one clause contained all the penal sanction by which the authority of the law of God was sustained. Nothing else but death was threatened as the punishment for sin. Nothing else, therefore, but death enters into its penalty. Sin may have, and does have, many other consequences besides death following it; and death, the penalty, may, and does, draw after itself many evils which fall upon the sinner; but these do not enter into, nor form any part of, the penalty. They are not the punishment that the law threatened in its penal clause, nor are they removed, so that they are not still suffered by the

penitent sinner, when pardon is vouchsafed to him through the atonement of Christ.

If we abide by these simple principles we shall escape the confusion which is often introduced at this point into the treatment of our subject. It is no uncommon thing to see writers and preachers go directly from the threatening contained in the penal clause of the divine law, to the divine recognition of other consequences of sin and of penalty, and incorporating these into their ideas and definitions of penalty, load it with much that was not threatened, and which pardon never removes. In this way many are brought to treat as penalty all those evils which the Lord named over to our first parents after they had sinned, and already come under the curse of transgression. These evils were dragged in the train of penalty, and had now become the fixed inheritance of man, while he should remain upon the earth ; but, we repeat, they cannot be counted the penalty of his sin, because they were not contained in the penal clause of the law to deter from sin, nor are they removed from the lot of men when they are pardoned.

The evils to which we allude are those that are set forth in the third chapter of Genesis: "Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception ; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children ; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." And unto Adam he said, "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it ; cursed is the ground for thy sake ; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life ; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field ; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground ; for out of it wast thou taken : for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return ;"

This passage is often treated, we say, as though it were the penal clause of the divine law. But there is not one word of threatening in it to deter from sin. It holds out no hope of escape from the woes foretold. It was not uttered until after the fatal transgression had been committed, and the divine

threatening that contained the penalty had already taken effect upon the guilty pair. The passage was simply the foretelling of those woes which were now unavoidable, whether those to whom it was addressed ever sinned again or not. And, we repeat it, not one of the evils of which the Lord here speaks is ever removed by the pardons which he grants to penitent sinners. They cannot, therefore, be included in the penalty of sin. They do not belong to it, nor form any part of it. If they did, then every pardoned sinner would cease to suffer them the moment he was pardoned, for pardon removes all of penalty. If any of the penalty of sin remains upon a sinner to be suffered by him, he is not pardoned, but is under condemnation still. If, therefore, any one of the evils named in this passage enters into the penalty of sin, there is not a pardoned sinner in the world, and never has been. For it is a contradiction in terms to speak of one's being pardoned, and at the same time suffering penalty. But we see pardoned women, like all others, having their "conception multiplied; in sorrow they bring forth children," just as other women do. Pardoned men, like all others, find the ground cursed for them; like others "they eat of it in sorrow all the days of their life." The earth, therefore, brings forth thorns and thistles for pardoned farmers, just as it does for those who are unpardoned. Moreover, they have to eat their bread in the sweat of their face, just as they did before they were pardoned. When, at last, both the pardoned and the unpardoned return alike to the dust whence they were taken. In all these respects, "one event happeneth to them all."

It is a curious circumstance that with this last fact standing out so distinctly in all the history of the world, it should have passed into a theological axiom, that "the penalty of sin is death natural, spiritual and eternal." But upon what principle can natural death—the separation of the soul from the body—be accounted any part of the penalty of sin? Pardon is the exact measure of penalty, and its mission is to save the guilty, to whom it is granted, from suffering it. But pardon does not save sinners from suffering natural death.

It has been said, indeed, that pardon does not take effect on this part of the penalty of sin until the body is raised from the grave, and that the resurrection is a part of the pardon of sin, as dissolution is a part of its penalty. But this does not relieve us of the difficulty ; for, in the first place, the bodies of the unjust are to be raised from the graves as well as those of the just. "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." If, therefore, the resurrection of the body is a part of pardon, or its effect, then the unjust are pardoned not less than the just, and the consequence is that some pardoned sinners are raised to "the resurrection of damnation." Then, secondly, it leaves the pardoned under condemnation until the resurrection, contrary to the express declaration of the Scriptures, that "there is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." A partial pardon, the removing of a part of the penalty from a believing penitent, and the leaving of the remainder of it upon him to be suffered, is, happily, an idea foreign to the gospel. In both its letter and its spirit, it repudiates the thought. Nothing could be farther from its teachings than that a child of God is, at the same time, a child of wrath, pardoned, and yet under condemnation ; saved and yet punished. God chastens his children ; but he does not punish them, visiting upon them the penalty of their sins. From this he wholly saves them by pardon. Otherwise the very meaning of pardon would be a mockery.

A fair sample of all the arguments that we have met with for the support of this theological axiom (most writers accepting it as an axiom, and therefore needing no proof), is that very dogmatic one of Turretin (Ques. xii 5.): "*Scriptura loquitur in genere de morte, Ergo sub ea complectitur quicquid nomine mortis venit in Scriptura ; atque ita non minus mors corporalis, quam eterna intelligenda est.*" This, though a very poor argument, is, nevertheless, a very good explanation, we apprehend, of the way in which the subject has become so confused in the popular mind. "*Scriptura loquitur in genere de morte :*" Ergo—without thought or discrimination, and without considering the consequences

involved in such an assumption. Death, in every sense in which the Scriptures use the word, is the penalty threatened to Adam in the garden. But if because "*Scriptura loquitur in genere de morte, Ergo sub ea complectitur, quicquid nomine mortis venit in Scriptura,*" then, when our Saviour says, "whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die," he means that the believer shall never suffer bodily death; because, "*non minus mors corporalis quam aeterna intelligenda est.*" But the believer does suffer bodily death, just as the unbelievers do. Our Lord had no reference, therefore, to bodily death, when he uttered these cheering words; and we must not include in the term "death," "*quicquid nomine mortis venit in Scriptura;*" nor must we, if we accept our Saviour's declaration as truth, include bodily death in penalty. The death from which he saves the believer is not the death of the body, but it is the death which is the penalty of sin.

We return then to our question: What is the penalty of sin? We have seen that it is simply and only death; but that it is not bodily death; that this does not enter into penalty, as one, the least, of its elements. We are led thus to inquire: What is that death which is the penalty of sin?

The Scriptures alone can guide us in our inquiry. These teach us, in the first place, that death, the penalty of sin, is something that came upon Adam as soon as he sinned. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," fixes the time of the execution of the penalty, as clearly as it does the name of the penalty itself. Words could not be combined so as to state with more positiveness, that death should follow at once upon transgression, and at once become the portion of the transgressor. This is so manifest, that men have been compelled, whatever views they have entertained regarding the nature of the death that was threatened, either to admit that it was, in some sense, inflicted immediately upon our first parents when they sinned, or to deny that it was ever inflicted on them. "Adam then became mortal," say some. Others, "he then came under sentence of, and became subject to death." Others have it that Adam then began to die, as we are sometimes told all men do, "as soon as they be born,"

and that he kept on dying for nine hundred and thirty years, at the end of which he really died—or, more properly, he stopped dying, having been all this time coming to that which Jehovah had solemnly said, in the penal threatening of his law, he should come to the day he sinned. But all these schemes of postponement are very unsatisfactory, as interpretations of the word of God. They are flatly opposed to the spirit of directness, and positiveness, which pervades the divine threatening; and, what is worse, if possible, they all leave pardoned sinners to suffer the penalty of their sins during their whole life upon the earth. To be dying for years the death that was threatened as penalty, is to be suffering that penalty for years; and to be subject to that death, and to be awaiting it to the end of earthly life as an inevitable doom, is to be subject to penalty, and awaiting its certain and inexorable infliction. Pardon is thus a nullity. But God does not thus trifle with men. The pardon which he promises to the penitent cannot but be real; and if real, it removes penalty from his lot, and removing this, it removes that which was called death by the penal clause of the law, and which came upon Adam the day he sinned.

We are unable to see why this argument is not a most effectual "short method" with all classes of "Annihilationists," who profess subjection to the authority of the Scriptures. If Adam died the day he sinned, and yet existed as a conscious and accountable being for nine hundred and thirty years thereafter, it is difficult to see that death, the penalty of sin, has anything whatever to do with the mere fact of conscious and accountable existence. It is true that men may come forward and calmly say, as that excessively superficial and illogical writer, Jenkyn, does say in his work on the "*Extent of the Atonement*," that "the penalty was not executed on man." They may then, as he does, begging the whole question, bring forward their doctrine, and lay it down as in itself an all sufficient refutation of the declaration of the Almighty. Jenkyn does this when he sustains the above denial by the assertion: "for then there would have been no human race. The first pair would have been de-

stroyed, and mankind would never have come into being." This would be reasoning, if it had been shown that death, the penalty of sin, was annihilation, or the utter ceasing of existence ; but inasmuch as this has not been shown, there is no reasoning in it. It is naked assertion ; nothing more nor less than Jenkyn versus Jehovah. It cannot be that men who reverence the authority of the Bible will be willing long to follow such teachers. But must they not follow them and accept their contradictions of divine assertions so long as they hold that the penalty of sin is extinction of being?

We may add, that the position assumed so confidently by Jenkyn and "Annihilationists" generally, is shown to be altogether untenable, by the same test which we have applied to the teaching of others who put bodily dissolution into the penalty of sin. Penalty is not, in that case, removed by pardon. If bodily death is the penalty of sin, and this is extinction of being, as Jenkyn's words imply, then all the men of past ages, from Adam down to the last generation before the present, saving only Enoch and Elijah, have suffered it. Pardoned and unpardoned have alike been swept away out of being by the fell destroyer, who, though he has seen the "blood on the two side posts, and on the upper door post of the houses" of the penitent and believing, has not "passed over" them. Down to the present hour, the penalty of sin, if this be its penalty, has been executed on man ; and if we judge the future by the past, it will continue to be executed on all, without distinction, until the sounding of the last trump. Is it not one of the necessary consequences of *extending* the real efficacy and highest purpose of the Atonement, as this writer does, that it should thus cease to have any efficacy whatever, and leave the whole race just where it found them? If, then, we assume that death, the penalty of sin, is extinction of being, and that this is accomplished by bodily dissolution, we are compelled, first, to do just as Jenkyn does, deny the truth of the Almighty's threatening, when He declared to Adam, "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," and, siding with the serpent, say, "nevertheless he did not die;" and then,

secondly, the solemn fact which history and observation force upon our attention, that all men do die, compels us to deliver over all classes of men, pardoned and unpardoned, believers in Christ and unbelievers, penitent and impenitent, to the fearful doom of the unsaved ; notwithstanding our Lord declares, regarding his people, that they shall never perish, and that none shall pluck them out of his hands.

If we are guided by the Scriptures we shall receive from them further, in answer to our inquiry, that death, the penalty of sin, is something that passed down from Adam upon the human race, and became their inheritance, as it was his: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin ; and so death passed upon all men." Through the offence of the one [τοῦ ἑνὸς] the many [οἱ πολλοί] died [ἀπεθάνον, aorist] —not became subject to death, or began to die, but died. That death which came upon Adam the day he sinned, went over upon, and became the portion of the race. As he was not only the constituted head of the race, but the race, when he sinned, it was the race that sinned when he sinned ; and as he was both the constituted head of the race and the race when he died, it was the race that died when he died. Whatever death was to him, the representative of the race, the day that he sinned, and all of human nature sinned in him, *that* death is to that nature, in whatever individual it has its embodiment ; and so death, whatever it is, is that which passed down through Adam, even as human nature itself did, to the race, and became their inheritance, as it was his. It is the constant representation, therefore, of the New Testament, that unregenerate men are not simply under condemnation, awaiting the execution of the death penalty, but that it has already taken effect upon them, and they have been devoted to it from the very beginning of their existence. They are born into death, and remain under its power until they are made alive by the energies of the Holy Spirit in their regeneration.

Hence the Scriptures teach us, thirdly, that death the penalty of sin, is something which is removed from the soul by its regeneration. Those passages of the Word of God which

sustain us in making this statement, sustain us also in making the statement immediately preceding it. They all presuppose and recognize the fact, that every unregenerate man is dead, by reason of his unregeneracy. A state of death is natural to him, as a descendant of Adam. The only living men are those who have been regenerated. By their regeneration they are delivered from death, which is theirs by nature, into life, which men never have but by grace. This is the uniform view of the New Testament writers, both as to what the salvation of a sinner is, and as to the method of his salvation. Let us look at a few passages in point: "We know," says the Apostle John, "that we have passed from death into life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." But what was the ground of this assertion? Why did he and those whom he addressed, know that the fact that they loved, established the fact that they lived? Was it not because it is a fundamental principle of the Gospel, that "love is of God, and every one that loveth hath been born of God?" To love, with the love of which the Apostle speaks, is to have been born again; and, by this birth, to have passed from death into life. To the same purpose is the declaration of Paul to the Ephesians, in that noted passage which is at once a key to all his teachings on the subject of life and death, in the higher import of these terms; and a summary of what, for want of a better form of expression, we may call his theory of the plan of salvation: "You, who were the children of wrath even as others, hath God made alive; who were—up to the time of his gracious interposition—dead in trespasses and sins." A little further on, putting himself among those whom he was addressing, he adds: "Even when we were dead, God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith He loved us, hath made us alive, together with Christ." Nothing, it would seem, could be more explicit. That process which changes a child of wrath into a child of God, that is, his being born into the family of God, his regeneration, makes him alive also from the dead. Up to the time of his regeneration he is dead; by that act he is made alive.

Another characteristic passage, which is full of the same thought, is that one in the eighth of Romans, where Paul says: "To be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." The same theory of the method of salvation is here clearly brought out. On this theory, which, be it remembered, is the theory of the Holy Ghost, every man is carnal until he is born again by the Spirit of God. This birth transforms him from a carnal into a spiritual man, and thus removes death from him, and causes him to live.

These passages are decisive of the point under consideration, even if they are taken by themselves, isolated from the great and fundamental principles involved in the declared necessity of regeneration; but read in the light of these principles, and taken, as they must be if taken rightly, as setting forth the method and kind of salvation necessitated by them, they give us a clearer and more absolute decision, resting on a broader foundation than that of mere proof texts. Thus taken, they cannot be weakened nor explained away, by the protest that they are only figurative; but they stand forth, the plain and unmistakable recognitions of what is real in the condition of the natural and of the spiritual man.

The Scriptures reply yet further to our inquiry, that death, the penalty of sin, is something from which a believer is saved through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The remark made respecting the passages quoted to sustain the preceding proposition—that they teach also that all natural men are dead—is applicable to the passages which we offer in support of this proposition; they all assume that is, or plainly declare, that all unbelievers are dead. A few passages will be sufficient, especially as they, too, are not to be regarded as isolated proof texts merely, though decisive of the point if thus taken, but as the unfolding of the method and kind of salvation necessitated by the character of man as an unbeliever, and by his relation to the divine government. Very marked and decided is that passage in the third chapter of John: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of

God abideth on him." The doctrine here taught cannot be misunderstood. If a man has not life he is dead ; but life he has not if he is an unbeliever ; and the death in which he lies is penalty, because it is that which rests upon him in the wrath of God. The same evangelist says again, in his first epistle, " he that hath the son hath life ; and he that hath not the son of God hath not life." He is dead, therefore, and he can never live, except through that agency by which he comes to " have the Son of God ;" that is, as the New Testament always teaches, through the exercise of faith in the Son of God. Hence it is that our Lord himself says: " He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live ; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." From that death which holds the unbeliever under its power he is released when he believes. From that moment he lives, and through faith in the Redeemer, he is thenceforth forever exempt from the claims of death, that is, of penalty upon him. We cite but one other passage out of the many which bear directly upon this point : " He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but has passed from death into life." That death which came upon him by sentence of condemnation, is removed from him through faith. These, and kindred passages of the Word of God, taken in connection with the constant teaching of the New Testament on the subject of life and death as related to penalty and salvation, leave us no room to doubt that the doom threatened in the penal clause of the law of God, as the punishment of the transgressor, is all removed from him when he believes in Him whom " God hath exalted, a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and forgiveness of sins."

Combining now the ideas contained in the two preceding statements, we shall have a direct, positive and satisfactory answer to our inquiry : What is death the penalty of sin ? First, it is that which is removed from the soul by regeneration. The immediate purpose and effect of regeneration, is, so to change the sinner's moral nature that he shall cease to be an enemy and become a lover of God. His enmity to God

is the special object towards which the energies of the Holy Spirit are directed when he transforms the sinner from a child of wrath into a son of God. Enmity dies away under the Spirit's mighty operation upon the sinner's heart, and love is created in its stead. This is the simple purpose and result of regeneration. When it has accomplished this it has done all its work ; for, with love to God come, in their germs at least, every other grace and power of the spiritual man ; as enmity to God carries with it every evil tendency, and all the intense selfishness and carnality of the natural man. He is then a child of God. All the elements of character that make one a child of God are within him, and they need only the fostering influences of sanctifying grace to develop and perfect them, so that he shall be "a perfect man," having attained "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." These principles are so obvious to every reader of the New Testament that we need not confirm them by any quotations.

That, then, which regeneration specially and directly removes from the soul of a sinner, is his enmity to God, and alienation of heart from him and holiness. These filled the soul of Adam, as they would fill the soul of any other hitherto holy moral agent, the day that he sinned. When he chose to disobey the command of God, all holy love died within him, and he found himself in utter alienation from his Maker. His soul had lost all its power and disposition to commune with God, "the fountain of life ;" and his enjoyment of him and of holiness ceased, as a stream ceases, when it is cut off from its fountain. Into this condition of enmity, and alienation and godlessness, he came the day that he sinned. He separated himself from God. This was his death. The innermost idea of death is that of separation ; and the innermost idea of the death of the soul is its separation from God. To lose all love for God, and to be cut off, by this want of love, from all communion with, and enjoyment of him, and of holiness, and to come thus under the dominion of evil desires, as opposed to those which are good, this is the death which is wrought *in* the soul "by trespasses and sins." This is the death out of which it is quickened—made alive—by the Holy Spirit in regeneration.

This is death viewed in its effects within the sinner himself: his moral character is such, that, by his very nature, he is not spiritual, but carnal ; not godly, but selfish—incapable of enjoying God or holiness ; separated by an impassable gulf from both. But this is not all. Unsaved sinners are not only enemies of God—God is their enemy. “He is angry with the wicked.” As the Executive of a holy but violated law, he holds them under sentence of condemnation. His wrath abides upon them. They are in displeasure, and are not permitted to come into his presence. He thus separates them from himself, the fountain of life, to be separated from which is to die, whether sinners cut themselves off by the ungodliness and carnality of their own characters, or the Almighty cuts them off in his anger, and by judicial abandonment of them on account of their sins. In either case the separation is death. In the latter it is death viewed as an effect pressing upon the soul from without, and sinking it forever away from all that is desirable in the favor of God, and in the bliss of his presence, into all that is terrible in his wrath and in eternal banishment from his presence.

This is the death which is removed through faith in the Son of God. The immediate purpose and effect of faith is so to change the relation of sinners to God, the Executive of a violated law, that he ceases to hold them under condemnation. Through faith they pass out from the judicial anger of the Lawgiver whom they have offended, and come into his favor. His wrath no longer abides on them ; but, from that moment, he bestows on them all the fulness of his love. He no longer separates them from himself as criminals and enemies, but welcomes them to his presence—as his children. Faith thus re-unites them with God. The fountain of life, and his “favor which is life,” flows forth in streams of infinite love into their souls, and they live forever. Death gives place to life ; condemnation and penalty to judicial favor and justification. They have thus “passed from death into life.”

These two things ; on the one hand, enmity, godlessness and carnality, separating the soul from God by their very nature ; and on the other hand, the wrath of God, and judicial aban-

donment and banishment from God, and from Heaven ; these, and only these, are removed from the sinner by his regeneration and his faith. These two things fell upon Adam the day that he sinned. They are removed from a sinner when he is pardoned. By their removal the Scriptures declare that he passes from death into life. Is it not certain that by their coming upon him he passed from life into death ? and that these are the elements of that death which is the penalty of sin ?

This has been the state of natural man ever since the fall, and, therefore, he has ever since been under penalty. But though penalty was executed, and man died the day that he sinned, yet the circumstances under which the race was placed were at once modified by mercy. Justice had its course ; but mercy was permitted to step in and *alleviate* the condition of the criminal, to the utmost possible extent consistent with righteousness. The race had had their probation, and lost it, under law. Mercy secured for them a new probation under grace. She was permitted because of "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," to carry to the condemned, who were already in penalty, the offer and the terms of pardon. While she waits to see what response men will make to her offers, she is allowed to stay, to a great extent, the fearful train of evils which penalty would otherwise drag after it. She has thus come into our prison-house and filled it with the light of her presence ; and she continues to employ all the mighty resources put into her hands by infinite love, in bettering the condition of the already lost, that she may bring them to salvation. The unpardoned are, therefore, in a state of *mitigated penalty*, while they remain in this world ; the pardoned are in a state of disciplinary training for a state where none of the evil consequences of sin will be found.

The probation of grace will end. Then mercy will have nothing further to do with the unpardoned. The dark inheritance of godlessness and carnality, and of banishment from God and Heaven, which they have chosen for themselves by transgression, and confirmed and augmented by the rejection of the Son of God, will be entered upon in its un-

mitigated fearfulness. When this event comes, and penalty is left to do its awful work, without the alleviations which a gracious probation secured for a sinner here; when, that is, the selfishness and carnality of the sinner's heart, his enmity to God and holiness are left to revel, unchecked by any of the circumstances, or influences for good, that now surround him; when the anger of an offended and insulted God strikes directly upon his soul, without those merciful refractions that now so lessen its consuming power; when mercy, that has held him up hitherto from the lower depths into which unalleviated penalty would have sunk him, holding him that she might offer him pardon and eternal life—when mercy withdraws her hand from beneath him, and her influences from about him, and the sentence comes from the throne of him who has been waiting to see the result of the probation of grace, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels;" then, when death becomes the fixed portion of the soul, and hope of salvation is forever withdrawn, and it is given over, out of the hands of mercy to eternal banishment from God and Heaven, after having had the opportunity of coming back to him, then the sinner enters into the SECOND DEATH, from which even infinite mercy and love cannot deliver it.

ARTICLE VI.—THE MILLENNIUM OF THE BIBLE.

[BY REV. HEMAN LINCOLN, PROVIDENCE, R. I.]

TRADITIONS have been handed down among many pagan nations, of a golden age in the distant past, when the gods had intercourse with men, and the earth was pure and happy. These traditions have found fit utterance by great poets, who have sung not only of a golden age in the past, but of a golden age in the future, when the face of the earth is to be renewed, and suffering and vice will be unknown. It is a curious fact in human history, that such ideas have entered into the religious systems of races among whom the Bible has been unknown. It indicates the existence of deep yearnings in the heart of man, sometimes vague and inarticulate, sometimes taking shape in song or prophecy, but all finding the dim ideal realized in the Paradise of Genesis, and the Millennium of the Apocalypse.

The expectation of a glorious era in the future was common to the Jews. They looked forward to it with eager hope in their national reverses, as a period whose glory and happiness would more than compensate for all their trials and captivities. Then the Messiah was to sit upon the throne of Israel, and reign with equity and peace over all the earth. The wolf also was to dwell with the lamb, and the leopard to lie down with the kid; the calf and the young lion, and the fatling together; and a little child to lead them. (Is. xi: 6.)

The belief in a Millennium, closely resembling the Messianic kingdom of the Jew, took root in the Christian Church at its very birth. We find it prominent in the writings of the fathers, who immediately succeeded the apostles, and generally associated with a belief in the immediate second coming of Christ, and his personal reign on earth. Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian paint glowing pictures of a

period of perfect happiness and holiness near at hand, as a support to Christians in the trials of persecution, and to martyrs in the agony of death. The Jew under the old economy anticipated the speedy coming of the Messiah to establish his kingdom on earth. The Christians of the first age, with an equal confidence, looked for his speedy second coming, and his universal reign.

The question naturally suggests itself to every reflecting mind, if the Jew, from his study of the prophetic Scriptures, failed to apprehend both the nature and circumstances of Christ's first coming, is it not possible that the early Christians may have fallen into similar errors respecting his second coming? So Origen thought, and endeavored to correct the opinions prevalent in his time. He believed neither in the personal reign of Christ, nor in the sensuous enjoyments so vividly sketched by other Christian teachers. He gave a spiritual interpretation to the Scripture predictions of the Millennium, but many of his views are wholly fanciful, and conformed to the allegorical tendencies of the Alexandrian School. Augustine agreed with Origen in his spiritual views, though differing widely from his allegorical mysticism. He taught that the new life given to man by the establishment of Christianity on earth, was the first resurrection spoken of in the xxth chapter of Revelation, and that Christ, by his death and resurrection, bound the dragon, and took away his power to deceive and destroy. The views of Origen and Augustine gradually supplanted in the church the grosser forms of Chiliasm, and the idea of a personal reign of Christ before the final judgment has found little favor, until revived in our century. In its place a belief has obtained, often vague and shadowy, and held without definite Scripture authority, that the knowledge of the gospel, and its regenerating power in the heart, are to spread, by the divine purpose, through the whole earth.

In the present article, we do not propose to examine the predictions of the Old Testament. They are numerous and complicated, and demand a special treatment. We refer only to a few, as presenting graphic pictures of the happiness to

prevail on earth, when a pure religion shall spread among all men.

"The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Hab. ii: 14.

"He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." Ps. lxxii: 8.

"And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him." Dan. vii: 14.

"And the Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one." Zechariah xiv: 9.

"Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever." Isa. ix: 7.

"From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to my name and a pure offering." Mal. i: 11.

These are strong passages, and their combined evidence is of great moment. They predict, beyond reasonable question, the restoration of Paradise to earth; when the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and peace and holiness shall prevail everywhere. But they give no indication of the time when this kingdom is to be set up, whether before or after the judgment. Nor do they shed any light on the inquiry whether the inhabitants of the world during this period will be true Christians, or only nominally such. Nor is their teaching decisive of the precise duration of this period, though the natural force of some expressions implies that it will not be subject to change or interruption, but will continue forever.

Our inquiry at the present time will have reference to the teaching of the New Testament. Are its declarations more definite and intelligible?

I.—The New Testament refers to the second advent of Christ as a certain event in the future, and one to be eagerly expected by his people.

When the disciples were despondent at the Last Supper, because Jesus had told them of the coming separation, He comforted them with the assurance that the parting would only be temporary. "I will *come again*, and receive you unto myself." The reference may not have been directly to his coming to judgment, but they seem to have so understood it, for after his resurrection they inquired eagerly, "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Acts i: 6. Alford says on this passage: "The *coming again of the Lord* is not one single act, as his resurrection, or the descent of the Spirit, or his second personal advent, or the final coming to judgment; but the great complex of all these, the result of which shall be his taking his people to himself to be where he is."

The angels who appeared to the weeping disciples after the ascension, repeated similar words of comfort: "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come [*οὕτως ἐλεύσεται ὁν τρόπον*] in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts i: 11. This can hardly mean less than that Jesus will come again in his ascension body, and visibly to lookers on, and in a cloud. Bengel thinks it worthy of special notice here that the angels do not say the disciples will witness the second advent, as an event soon to be expected, but simply that he will come again in the same visible form in which he ascended.

"Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for (*ἀπεχδεχόμεθα*) the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." Phil. iii: 20. *ἀπεχδεχόμεθα* has a stronger force than in the English version, implying we wait *with longing*, with an eager desire.

"Waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." I. Cor. i: 7. The participle is from the same verb as in the last passage, and has the same force.

"To wait for his Son from heaven." (*ἀναμένειν*) I. Thess. i: 10. The expectation of the coming of Christ is alluded to here by the apostle as one of the powerful motives which induced the Thessalonians to turn from idol-worship.

"To the end He may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming (*τῇ*)

παρουσία, the same word used in Matt. xxiv. to denote Christ's coming to the destruction of Jerusalem) of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints" (τῶν ἁγίων, saints or angels). I. Thess. iii: 13. "Looking for (προσδεχόμενοι, looking forward to with eagerness) that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Titus ii: 13. The construction here is peculiar. προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The best critics and expositors agree that both ἡμῶν and μεγάλου should be construed as qualifying θεοῦ and σωτῆρος, and that the passage should be rendered, "Looking forward eagerly to that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of the great Being, who is our God and Saviour." In support of this rendering it is well said that the Scriptures nowhere speak of the appearance of God as a part of the great pageant with which this economy is to close. They declare, on the other hand, that "no man hath seen him, or can see him."

"Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin unto salvation;" Heb. ix: 28, *i. e.*, Christ, at his second coming, will make no expiation for sin, but will give eternal happiness to all his people, who look for him.

These and other passages make it evident that the Saviour's second advent was an event eagerly expected in the apostolic age, and regarded as significant of the greatest blessings to the church. It was to be not a gradual and continuous event, but startling from its suddenness, as the lightning shines from the east to the west. It was also to involve destruction to the wicked. "Whom the Lord shall consume with the breath of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." II. Thess. ii: 8.

II.—The New Testament leaves no place for a Millennium between the second advent of Christ and the final judgment.

One theory of the pre-millennial reign of Christ, as held in our day, we believe to be as follows: The present economy is nearly completed. The Saviour will soon descend from heaven in the same glorified body in which he ascended from Olivet. He will call the righteous dead from their graves,

change the living saints to an immortal state, destroy the living wicked, and burn up the world. From the ruins of the conflagration will spring up a new earth, pure and beautiful, on which the saints will dwell, and over which Jesus will reign a thousand years. At the close of this period the wicked dead will be raised, the final judgment be set, and saints and sinners be adjudged to their eternal abodes.

The passage generally relied on to support this theory, is the twentieth chapter of Revelation. It speaks of a *first* resurrection — of the souls of martyrs raised and reigning — of a binding of Satan for a thousand years — and another resurrection after the thousand years are finished. These seem to be important elements in the pre-millennial theory. But a closer examination of the passage lessens the force of its testimony. It speaks only of the resurrection of martyrs beheaded for the witness of Jesus; and declares expressly that none but martyrs partake of the resurrection and the new life. Nor do *all* martyrs feel its power. It seems to be confined to those who have not worshipped the beast, nor received his mark. There is no hint of a change by which living saints are made immortal. Nor is it even asserted that the *bodies* of the martyred saints are raised — the inspired revelator sees in his vision their “souls” living under the reign of Christ. The passage, therefore, falls far short of confirming the pre-millennial theory, which requires that the bodies of *all* dead Christians be raised — all living Christians be transformed — and all living sinners be destroyed. The passage is confessedly a mysterious one, and as it was discussed elaborately, and with great ability, in the July number of *The Review*, for 1862, we need not examine it minutely in the present article.

Apart from this passage, the whole teaching of the New Testament seems to bear decisively against the theory. It allows no interval between the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked. The two are simultaneous, forming a single act in the drama of human destiny.

“*When* (*ὅταν*) the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* (*τότε*) shall he sit on

the throne of his glory, and before him shall be all nations, and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." Matt. xxv: 31-2. The direct force of this passage cannot be doubted or evaded. The process of judgment is to be coincident with his second coming. The judgment of the wicked and the good is really one stage in the advent. There is no interval left for a reign of a thousand years. *When he comes, then shall the nations be gathered.*

"Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." John v: 28-9. It would be hypercritical to maintain that the word "hour" (*ᾠρα*) has here its literal meaning; but fidelity to the laws of language forbids us to suppose that it can embrace a period of a thousand years. The meaning of the passage is obvious, that by a single act of the divine power the good and the wicked are raised, without distinction of time, and then, by the award of the judgment, are parted finally and forever.

"For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. Then (*ἔττα*, apparently in close connection) cometh the end. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." I. Cor. xv: 22-6. We understand the reference here to be solely to physical death and resurrection, the one as connecting the whole race with Adam, and the other with Christ. Others restrict the dying, and the making alive, to spiritual death and regeneration. If the verb *ζωοποιέω* were never used in other than a spiritual sense, this restriction might be accepted, though apparently out of place in a discussion of the resurrection of the body. But in the 36th verse of this chapter it is applied to the development of the new germ in the buried seed; in Rom. iv: 17, it relates to the dead body, or the generative system after its vitality is lost; in I. Tim. vi: 13, to the general creative or renewing power of God; and in I. Peter iii: 18, to the

reviving of the buried Saviour, where it cannot mean the implanting of a new spiritual life. As it admits, therefore, of so wide a range of application, it is more natural to apply it here to the quickening of the dead bodies of the whole race, by virtue of their connection with Christ. And as "the *end*" is placed in immediate connection with Christ's coming, and "the *last* enemy to be destroyed is death, it would seem to be the plain teaching of the passage that at his second coming he shall manifest his power over death, the last enemy, by calling the dead of the whole human race from their graves.

Not only does the New Testament describe the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked as simultaneous, but it seems to take for granted that the chief object of the second advent is to set up the judgment, and allot men to their final destiny.

The passage already alluded to in the xxvth chapter of Matthew, gives decisive testimony on this point. Christ comes in great state and glory, attended by his angels, to sit on the throne of his glory, and gather all nations before Him.

Another passage is even more explicit. "And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his Saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." II. Thess. i: 7. Several points here are worthy of note. Vengeance is to fall on the wicked, *when* the Lord Jesus is revealed from Heaven, not after a long reign on Earth. The destruction is not for a limited period, but is *everlasting*, and is to occur when he comes to be glorified in his saints. We see no possible room here for an interval of a thousand years between the glorifying of the saints and the eternal destruction of the wicked.

"I charge thee, therefore, before the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." II. Tim. iv: 1. Could language teach more

plainly that the judgment of dead and living is to be synchronous with Christ's appearing; and that the setting up of the judgment is, in a peculiar sense, the setting up of his Kingdom?

"Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints (*ἁγίων*, angels) to execute judgment upon all." Jude xiv : 15. (*πορεύσας χρίσιν κατὰ πάντων*) That is, Christ makes his second advent for the purpose of executing judgment, and the judgment embraces all the race.

In harmony with this view are those passages which refer to the judgment as a definite and dreadful *day* for the whole world.

"He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge *the world* in righteousness." Acts xvii : 31.

"The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night." I. Thess. v : ii. II. Peter iii : 10.

"Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God." II. Peter iii : 12.

The concurrent force of these passages can hardly be mistaken. They teach that the personal reign of Christ at his second advent cannot be identical with the Millennium, as commonly received by the Church. It will not be a continuance of the Christian economy, for that is finally closed at the judgment, when probation ends. Nor is it to endure for a limited period; for the kingdom to be set up is an everlasting kingdom, and Jesus delivers up his mediatorial rule to the Father. The second advent will introduce the eternal states of Heaven and Hell. If righteousness is to prevail on earth at any period before the final judgment, the Pre-millennial theory, it would seem, must be abandoned, or greatly modified to make provision for it.

III. The world will not be filled with true Christians at the second advent of Christ.

The parables of the tares of the field, and the fish taken in the net, teach very plainly that the wicked will be living in close connection with Christians at the time of Christ's coming. A special duty will be assigned to angels to separate the wicked from the just, and prepare them for the award of

the judgment. These parables intimate another truth of higher importance, that at no period in the world's history will the Church be composed of true converts only. False professors will live in fellowship with the saints of God, until their deception is exposed, and their hypocrisy punished at the final judgment.

The same truth is taught in the historical similitudes of the Saviour, in the xxivth chapter of Matthew: "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away: so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." That these words refer to the second coming of Christ rather than the destruction of Jerusalem is obvious from the preceding language: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of Heaven, but my Father only." This meaning is confirmed by other allusions of the Saviour and the Apostles, to the suddenness and unexpectedness of his coming, comparing it often to the coming of a thief in the night. The language indicates that just before the end of the present economy, a general indifference to religious interests will prevail through the world, and an abandonment to sensual pleasures. This state of careless enjoyment and ungodliness will be interrupted by the appearance of the Son of Man, coming in the clouds of Heaven to the final judgment.

The sad question of the Saviour in the parable of the unjust Judge: "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the Earth?" Luke xviii: 8, implies that in the visible church there will be a great deficiency of vital piety, when He shall come to judgment.

Most of the passages, also, which refer to the coming to judgment, assert that vengeance will be executed on the living who know not God, as well as on the wicked dead raised from their graves.

The conclusion is inevitable, therefore, that the world will not be in a state of holiness at the time of the Saviour's second advent.

IV. Will there be any Millennium on the Earth before the Judgment? Is it a part of the Divine Plan that, under the Christian Economy the spiritual power of the Gospel shall be felt among all nations?

It must be confessed that the proof texts are very few, and the belief which has been almost universal in the Christian Church, rests on a foundation not very substantial. The Old Testament prophecies are full of glowing pictures of the Church in its triumphant state, under the Messianic reign of Christ. But it is not easy to interpret the symbolical language, or the poetical hyperboles; nor is it certain that the descriptions do not apply to the state of the redeemed in Heaven, rather than to the kingdom of Christ on Earth.

The passages in the New Testament, bearing directly on the question, are neither numerous nor decisive. But its general spirit warrants the expectation that true religion will spread among all nations. The command to preach the gospel in all the world, and the promise of Christ to be with his people always in the discharge of this duty, is an obscure intimation, at least, that their labor shall be attended with success. The declaration that the Gospel must be preached among all nations before the end can come, bears in the same direction.

The Saviour taught his disciples to pray "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven." Matt. vi: 10. It is a natural inference that if He made it the duty of Christians to offer this prayer, it is his purpose to fulfil the petition, at some future time. But the language gives no intimation of the period when this shall be done; whether on the earth, as it now is, or on the new earth, purified by a baptism of fire, and made the abode of the saints. Nor does it shed any light on the question whether the change shall be a gradual process, or be effected by a sudden and mighty agency. The Saviour, in predicting the ultimate results of his death, said, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." John 12: 32. This may mean that his salvation will be limited to no particular nation, but will draw man, as man, to feel its power. Or it may mean, that at some future period

in the world's history, all living men will be led to yield discipleship to Christ.

In Romans xi : 25, Paul says: "I would not that ye should be ignorant, brethren, that blindness in part has happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved." This language gives a glimpse at the great plan by which God designs to accomplish the salvation of the world. All Gentile nations are to be first converted ; then his ancient people, the Jews, are to be recovered from apostasy, and Christ is to be worshipped among all people, from the river to the ends of the earth.

In Heb. viii : 11, the apostle applies a passage from the Old Testament to this same period of the recovery of the chosen people. "And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord, for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest." This looks like a positive prediction of a coming millennial state, when the earth shall be filled with righteousness.

Two passages in the New Testament seem to teach explicitly that the influence of the Gospel is to spread gradually through the whole world. These are the parables of the mustard-seed, and the leaven ; the former denoting the outward and visible progress of religion in the world ; and the latter, the inward and assimilating power by which its spirit will renew a corrupt humanity. It is not easy to evade the direct force of these parables. Their meaning is simple and unquestioned. They teach that the Christian religion is to prevail on earth ; not by any extraordinary interposition, as the personal advent of Christ, but by a gradual growth, extending from land to land, and nation to nation, and heart to heart, till the whole world is brought under its influence.

How can this view be reconciled with our *third* statement, that the world is not to be Christian at the second coming of Christ? We know of but one method. It is to suppose that subsequent to the general diffusion of the Gospel over the earth, a partial or general apostasy will take place, and irreligion will again for a short period overrun the world. Frequent intimations are given in the epistles of such an apostasy.

"Now the spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." I. Tim. iv: 1.

"This know, also, that in the last days perilous times shall come." Among other impending troubles the apostle specifies, "that many will have a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." II. Tim. iii: 1.

"Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts." II. Peter, iii: 3.

"Beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. How that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts." Jude 17.

"Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." II. Thess. ii: 3.

These intimations are not decisive, for it is not easy to give a definite sense to the term "last time." John, in alluding to the coming of Anti-christ, says: "He is already come, and therefore it is the last time." It is not safe to affirm, with too much positiveness, that the apostasy of the "last time" will immediately precede the judgment.

But when we bring in the mysterious passage in Rev. xx., already alluded to, in connection with the results to which we have been led by other portions of the New Testament, it seems to give a connected and intelligible view of future events. Satan is to be bound, either for a thousand years, or for an indefinite period, of which this perfect number is a symbol. During his long imprisonment his power of deceiving men is taken away. With such a formidable obstacle removed, Christianity will naturally diffuse itself gradually through the entire world. Is it not probable that in this period the parables of the mustard-seed and the leaven are verified? and the prophecies, that all men shall be drawn to the cross, and all flesh shall know the Lord, find fulfilment? and the ingathering of the Gentiles, and the reclaiming of the Jews, are effected? and the petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Thy kingdom come" is accomplished?

But this state of holiness will not continue to the end. "The day of the Lord shall not come, except there come a falling away first." After Satan's long term of confinement, "he is to be loosed for a season, and go forth to deceive the nations." Is not this time of loosing coincident with the falling away which precedes the second advent of Christ—with the general apostasy which the apostles predict, and the worldliness and irreligion which Jesus foretells? In the midst of this general carelessness and self-security, resembling that which prevailed before the flood, suddenly the trumpet sounds; the Saviour appears; the dead are raised; the living changed; the judgment set; the state of probation ends, and the eternal state begins.

Such is the conclusion to which we are led, after a patient examination of all the passages in the New Testament referring to the second coming of Christ. We can find no certain allusion to any future advent, except the advent to judgment; nor of any personal reign, unless it be on the renewed earth, after the Christian economy has closed. If there is to be a Millennium, corresponding to the glowing predictions of the Old Testament prophecies, and to the general expectations of the Christian Church, it must be a Spiritual Millennium, before Christ's second advent.

ARTICLE VII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Reconstruction of Biblical Theories, or Biblical Science improved in its History, Chronology and Interpretation, &c. By LEICESTER AMBROSE SAWYER. Boston. 1862.

THIS is a book of 195 pages. The author having spent many years in the laborious study of the Scriptures, has at length given to the public the partial fruits of his researches, partly in revised translations of the Scriptural records, and partly in this work, in which he propounds his theories of interpreting them. Of his translations we have before spoken in this journal; we here notice the new work which he has issued regarding theories of Biblical interpretation. He styles his work, "Biblical Science Improved." We regret to say that we do not think his "improvements" will commend themselves as such to the judgment of the church generally, or of sound Biblical scholars. Without wishing to detract a particle from the honesty, the diligence, and the spirit of fearless inquiry which may characterize Mr. Sawyer, and his contributions to Biblical Science, we must express the most serious doubts whether that science or the interests of Christianity are receiving any benefit at his hands. Indeed, we confess that we think the publication of this book by a man professing to be a Christian minister, argues no ordinary boldness. Our readers shall have a specimen or two by which to judge for themselves.

The author vindicates Moses from being the author of books of which he thinks so poorly as the Pentateuch. "The first part of the Bible, from Genesis to the end of II. Kings, is a single work of the time of Ezra, and perhaps from his pen; but he transcribes portions of earlier works, all of which have perished. The style of the book, is not that of the Book of Ezra, which is a later composition, but of the *time* of Ezra. Its divisions are arbitrary, as well as the names assigned them, and some of them injudicious."

Vol. xxviii.—10.

The author gives us a new translation of the chapter on the creation, with comments; although it was according to him no creation. "The recognition of matter as created, did not belong to any ancient systems, either Hebrew or Greek. They did not, therefore, reach the true doctrine of creation." The author does not think highly of this record of the creation: it is full of conjectural theories which science has demolished, and "its highest lesson is the illustration which it affords of the folly and presumption of undertaking to judge of God and his doings *a priori*." Still he kindly admits that it is not an "imposition." "It has every appearance of being an honest fiction; it exhibits no more indications of an intention to deceive than the Pilgrim's Progress, or Homer's Iliad." Nay, "correctly interpreted, it becomes both harmless and useful." These admissions we thankfully receive.

But the author is in the full tide of improvement. The divine origin of the Sabbath, therefore, and the story that Eve was formed from a rib taken out of the side of Adam, he rejects with contempt. With the Garden of Eden and its scenes, he makes curious work. He evidently knows all about the matter. The significance of the matter is, that man first appears as engaged in "tree culture." "History finds him alone, without a wife, living like a beast of the forest, on forest fruits." But after "tree culture" comes the "invention of language," the use of sounds and articulations to denote things. "Both of these arts began with Adam, the first stock man known to tradition; where the race had been, and what it had been doing before this stage, we may guess, or accept the opinion of the traditionist if we think proper." But the race is in the way of improvement, and its progress is rapid. After tree culture and language, comes marriage, and then, the greatest step of all, he becomes rational, and finally pious. The transition to a state of reason is due proximately to his wife, but ultimately and mainly to "the introduction and use of a new kind of food." Eve found this food and gave it to man; because, the race not having got up to civilization, woman was the servant and drudge of man, and "was allowed to make herself useful by gathering and laying up the forest fruits for the support of the family." Eve in her explorations lighted upon a larger and finer fruit than Adam had yet tried: she, perhaps, had a pet serpent upon which she tried its virtues. The result was favorable; the serpent grew fat on it, and then she and Adam ate of it with the happiest results, the race being immediately "raised to a higher elevation than it had ever before been gained." Such is the importance of good food. Some have supposed this fruit the apple, some a fig, "but the more

probable opinion is that it was wheat and the other cereal grains." This was the great upward step of humanity. That which the allegorist has ignorantly represented as the fall of man, was in fact his rise; his first and great transgression passes over into the first and noblest act by which he arose to seek the true end of his being; and God, instead of disapproving and condemning his progress in becoming rational, could only favor and approve.

We will not follow out the details of these "improvements." There are a great many of them. Mr. Sawyer has a fertile brain and a searching philosophy. The Old Testament is a cob-house in his hands, which he can demolish and re-construct at pleasure. It is not easy to say where his improvements will end, but it is perfectly apparent where they will *not* end. They will not terminate with the venerable records of the Old Testament. The Biblical Science of the New will have to undergo the same searching and improving process as that of the Old; for it rests upon and assumes the truth of that. The story of Jesus Christ will go into the same limbo of fable and allegory, of corrupt tradition and ignorant invention, with the histories of Adam and the Patriarchs. The Bible will be improved into a work of the same value with the poems of Hesiod and Ovid, and Mr. Sawyer will take his place, where in fact he has already taken his place, in the extreme van of the ranks of the Theodore Parkerites and the Westminster Reviewers.

We do not deny that there are yet many difficult problems connected with the interpretation of the Old Testament; but either the highest laws of evidence must fail, or that solution of these problems will yet prevail which vindicates, against all cavil and objection, their heaven descended origin and their substantial verity.

John Albert Bengel's Gnomon of the New Testament. Pointing out from the natural force of its words, the simplicity, depth, harmony and saving power of its divine thoughts. A new translation, by CHARLTON T. LEWIS, M. A., and MARVIN R. VINCENT, M. A., Professors in Troy University. Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins. 1862. Vol. I., 8vo., pp. 925; Vol. II. pp. 980.

THE first impression made on us by these thick volumes was, that strange work must have been made with the terse and pithy Latin of Bengel to have swelled a translation into such enormous bulk. A brief glance at the text, and then at the preface, quickly solved the mystery. It is not merely a translation that is attempted, but an emendation as well. We have virtually a new commentary, on the basis of Bengel

except that Bengel is left unmutated, and the emendations, which consist of excerpts from numerous authors, are appended in brackets. The translators wisely concluded that too much progress had been made in Biblical science since Bengel's day to warrant the publication of a mere translation of his work. They have summoned other authors, particularly De Wette, Lücke, Olshausen, Meyer, and Alford to correct and supplement him.

The present translation is made from the Steudel edition of the original, and though diligently compared with the translation published by the Messrs. Clarke of Edinburgh, to which it is greatly indebted, is an independent and more accurate version. The translators say of their work, "an attempt has been made to render the whole book intelligible to those who have no knowledge of the ancient languages, by removing all difficulties not really inherent in the subject or the thought." And the attempt has been, to a degree unusual in such cases, a successful one. The demand for commentaries among readers who are familiar with only their mother English, is steadily and rapidly increasing. Such readers will find this amended version of Bengel well suited to their necessities.

Professor Lewis attaches great importance to his critical revision of the Greek text, after Tischendorf and Alford. He supposes the commentary will now "serve the English reader as a *Critical English Testament*. By comparing this work with the authorized English version, the student will be able, without any knowledge of Greek, to understand the precise results of modern criticism in revising the text of the New Testament." On the value of this part of his labors, we are sorry not to place so high an estimate as the author seems to do. Doubtless there are English readers who will appreciate them, but in the present state of textual revision, we greatly doubt their utility to the general public.

The Canon of the Holy Scriptures, Examined in the light of History.

By Prof. L. GAUSSEN, of Geneva, Switzerland, author of "*Theopneusty*," "*Birth-day of Creation*," etc., etc. Translated from the French, and abridged by EDWARD N. KIRK, D. D. Published by the American Tract Society, Boston. 12mo., pp. 463.

PROF. GAUSSEN has been long and widely known by his work on the Inspiration of the Scriptures. The present treatise was intended to be a sequel to that work. The two are strikingly harmonious in their method, spirit, argument and theory. The intervening years of study

between the composition of the two, which were not few, seem in no way to have shaken his earlier convictions.

The original work on the Canon, consisting of two large octavos, is in two unequal parts, the first and larger of which discusses the external or historical evidences, and is entitled by the author, "*The Method of Science*;" the second treats of the internal or self-witnessing testimony of the Bible itself, and is entitled, "*The Method of Faith*." The translator gives us only the first part, or historical argument, and this wisely reduced, by abridgment and condensation, to the limits of a single convenient volume. In its present form the survey is both broad and minute enough for every purpose which the work is fitted to serve.

The author is a very firm believer in the canonicity of both Testaments, just as they stand. The claims of the Apocalypse, and of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are specially considered, and the right of the Epistles of James and Jude, of the second of Peter, and of the second and third of John to their places in the canon is vigorously defended.

The work has been prepared, the author informs us, "in view of the numerous attacks recently made" on the Canon. We could wish that the nature and ground of the attacks had been more clearly pointed out than they have been, and the feeling of security thus more firmly established in those whose faith has been shaken. The well-beaten pathway of previous writers is traversed with a discerning eye, but no new lines of defence are pointed out, no new barriers erected. To the unperverted inquirer, who asks simply for the historical evidence of canonical Scripture, Prof. Gaussen's work will supply a lucid and satisfactory answer; and Dr. Kirk and the American Tract Society of Boston, have laid the churches under obligation by giving it to the American public in an English dress; but to minds that have been imbued with distrust, and made inquisitive by sceptical assaults, Mr. Westcott's *General View of the History of the Canon* will be a safer and more satisfactory treatise. The translation, like that of the Theopneusty from the same hand, is in good, perspicuous, easy, idiomatic, and even elegant English.

PRACTICAL RELIGION.

Church Discipline, in two parts, Formative and Corrective; in which is developed the true Philosophy of Religious Education. By Rev. ELEAZER SAVAGE, Rochester, N. Y. (second thousand). Sheldon & Company, New York. 1863.

CHRISTIANITY is a religion that teaches and trains its adherents by

enlightening their minds, by reforming their habits and disciplining their hearts. How far the Christian spirit shall be left to the freedom of its own spontaneity, and how far it shall be subjected to a formal discipline, is a question to which the most opposite and extreme answers have been given. If the Methodists have shown a tendency to one extreme, it must be admitted that some Baptists have exhibited a leaning to the other. Mr. Savage in preparing his book has performed a needed service, and performed it well. He presents clearly and comprehensively the preventive and curative means to be employed, and has enunciated distinctly the principles which lie at the foundation of all personal Christian character, as well as of all church prosperity. Chap. v., Part I., entitled "Formative Agents and Means," contains a great many useful hints to both ministers and Sabbath-school teachers, besides many needed suggestions and just remarks on "revival efforts." We cordially commend the book to the attention of pastors and churches generally.

A Manual of Worship, suitable to be used in legislative and other public bodies, in the army and navy, and in military and naval academies, asylums, hospitals, etc. Compiled from the forms and in accordance with the common usages of all Christian denominations. And jointly recommended by eminent clergymen of various persuasions. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1862.

WE have no doubt that there are occasions when the choice between no religious service and a service conducted by a person who knows nothing experimentally of religion, would make such a manual as this desirable. Doubtless, also, there are persons officiating as chaplains in the army and navy, and there may be those in military academies, asylums, hospitals, etc., whose ministrations would be edifying in proportion to the frequency of their use of the forms of worship laid down in this manual, but that an intelligent Christian minister could make use of these forms as the stated vehicles of his thoughts and emotions, we do not believe. We half suspect an intended irony in the "discretionary use" of the "recommendation" in which a large number of very respectable clergymen of all denominations "cordially unite." We doubt if any one of them would content himself with the use of these forms on any conceivable occasion. Should a man, pretending to conduct religious service in the places and on the occasions contemplated by the compiler of these forms, not know how to select appropriate scripture, or to adapt his prayer to a given emergency, by all means let him procure this little manual of worship.

Springs of Action. By Mrs. C. H. B. RICHARDS, author of "*Sedgemoor*," "*Pleasure and Profit*," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

IN a number of familiar essays on such topics as Health, Industry, Cheerfulness, Generosity, Patience, etc., Mrs. Richards has embodied a great deal of wise counsel to the young generally, but more particularly to those of her own sex. Her advice is kindly administered, and enforced in a sprightly though somewhat gossiping way, by illustrations drawn chiefly from her own circle of acquaintance, and, of course, recognizable by many who will read her book. But as we must suppose this to have been done with consent, the reader need not fear that any hallowed sanctuary has been carelessly invaded.

Mrs. Richards shows that keen insight into human nature, especially woman nature, which is the result of long and vigilant introspection, as well as of close study of character as presented in society. This power, in part a gift, but chiefly an attainment, has been usefully and prudently employed by her in the little volume before us: we cordially commend it to the young, and to those who have the responsibility of training them.

Sermons, preached and revised by the Rev. C. H. SPURGEON. Seventh Series. New York: Sheldon & Co., Publishers. 1862.

A NEW volume of Spurgeon will be regarded by many as a hazardous venture. The illjudged remarks of the author on the causes and objects of our great National Strife, have very naturally alienated many a former friend. But whoever has been interested or profited by his other volumes, will find this not unequal in its best elements, to any one that has preceded it. In the present volume, each sermon is preceded by a prefatory note, in which we are told when the sermon was delivered, for what purpose, and with what results, and in many instances are kindly informed what estimate should be put upon the discourse, should we proceed to read it. The *smartness* of some of these notes is a little amusing.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Memoirs of the Rev. Nicholas Murray. D. D. (Kirwan). By SAMUEL IRENÆUS PRIME, author of "*Travels in the East*," "*The Power of Prayer*," etc., etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1862.

WHEN Dr. Murray was a youth fifteen years of age, he landed, in

company with a crowd of emigrants, in New York City. A poor, strange, and rather unpromising looking Irish lad, he sought employment through the city, till, by the good providence of God, he was taken into the employ of the well known business house of the Harpers and put to such work as he seemed best fitted for. He was not only taken into their book establishment, but received also as an inmate of their family; and it was from the pious example and religious instruction of the devoted Christian mother of the Harper brothers, that the young emigrant received his first impulse to seek for a pure Christianity. Educated in the faith, and to the devout observance of all the forms, of the Roman Catholic Church, he had yet, before leaving home, seen with his clear discriminating eyes much in the practice of his church to awaken doubt and invite inquiry. His mother, though undoubtedly a woman of much strength of character, was untutored and bigoted. When, in opposition to her wishes, her son abandoned first his apprenticeship, and then his country, she had him cursed from the altar, and on hearing of his conversion to Protestantism, she had masses said for the repose of his soul, and regarded him, ever after, as one dead. Such were the antecedents of the distinguished "Kirwan," who in his celebrated encounter with Bishop Hughes, put to silence his able opponent, and by his logic, his wit, and his acumen, challenged the admiration of the lettered world. His discussion has been translated into almost every language of Europe, and constitutes one of the standard works in defence of Protestantism.

The history of the early career of the good-humored, quick-witted Irish boy, is entertaining, and full of instruction to the young. We give an extract from the recollections of the Rev. J. B. Steele, a fellow-boarder with young Murray while he was yet in the employment of the Harpers.

"In the winter of 1820, I resided with Mr. George Kirk in Liberty Street, and was a student in my senior year, in Dr. Mason's Seminary, receiving the instruction of Dr. Alexander M'Leod, Dr. Alexander McClolland, and Dr. Knox. Mr. Kirk was a Scotchman of the old school, very intelligent, pious, orthodox, and a great hater of Dr. Watts' Psalms and Hymns. He was a member of Dr. Mason's Church. There was also in the family a maiden lady of great intelligence and piety, Margerie M'Leod. She was a prim lady, wore a high turban, was very dignified in her manners, and a very kind-hearted woman. She still lives, and is over ninety years of age. She had a select school of young ladies from the best families in the city, the second school of the kind in New York after Mrs. Graham's. She had with her in her school her niece, an educated young lady. Into this family came young

Murray in the fall of 1821; he was seventeen or eighteen years of age. At that time he was a stout, thick-set, clumsy-looking boy. He was singularly dressed; had a round, open, generous face; was full of Irish wit, humor, joke, and blunder. His manners, though awkward, were soon overlooked, and he became the favorite of the whole family. At every meal we anticipated his good humor; and, while we all enjoyed his pleasantries, it was not long before we discovered that he possessed real native talent, and the high-turbaned lady was the first to say, 'That young man should be educated.' Mr. Kirk kept a store, which prevented him frequently from attending morning prayers, and sitting with his family at meals; and it usually fell to my lot to conduct the devotions of the family, ask a blessing and return thanks, according to the good old custom, when people had time to eat and thank the Lord. Murray at this time had made a profession of religion, and appeared to be a genuine Christian. He was always willing to listen to pious discourse, and much pains were taken to cultivate his grace and lead him to exercise some spiritual gifts. I had much conversation with him on subjects of this nature, and said to him on one occasion, 'Murray, I will ask you some day to return thanks at the table, and you must not refuse; you must serve the Lord openly, and now is a good time to commence.' A few days after, at the table, when we had just had considerable amusement, I turned to Murray and said 'Return thanks.' The company were astonished, Murray was confounded, and raising up both hands, he said:

"Come Holy Spirit, heavenly dove,
With all thy quickening powers;
Come shed abroad a Saviour's love
In these cold hearts of ours. Amen."

"The ludicrous scene was indelible. The high-turbaned lady and the whole company were in a roar of laughter as Murray left the room and ran to his bed-chamber. I followed, and found him in a perfect state of confusion, and said, 'Why, Murray, what have you been doing? When I ask you to return thanks, you should not repeat Watts' hymns; besides, if Mr. Kirk should hear you repeat *Watts*, he would turn you out of the house.' The only reply he gave me was, 'You took me by surprise, but I will try and do better next time,' and so he did. After preparing the family for his second effort, he expressed himself with great propriety. In less than a month he took his regular turn, and before the end of the second month he engaged in turn in conducting family worship, and at the end of three months he held forth in prayer and exhortation at the social meetings in Dr. Spring's church."

In 1830 Mr. Murray was joined in marriage to the daughter of the Rev. Morgan Rhees, a distinguished Welch clergyman of the Baptist denomination. The cheerful piety of Dr. Murray, his unselfishness in all the relations of life, public and private, his faithful and successful ministry, and his eminently calm and happy death, furnish beautiful lessons, in part, unconsciously conveyed by his own letters and autobiographical records, and, in part, by the reminiscences of attached friends.

Mr. Prime's work was purely a labor of love, and is well executed.

Memoirs of Mrs. Joanna Bethune. By her Son, the Rev. GEORGE W. BETHUNE, D. D. With an Appendix containing extracts from the writings of Mrs. Bethune.

THE last literary labor of the Rev. Dr. Bethune, previous to his departure for Europe, and to his death, was the preparation of these interesting memoirs of his beloved mother. Mrs. Isabella Graham (with whose life many of our readers are familiar) was residing at Fort Niagara with her husband, a surgeon in the British army, when their second daughter, Joanna, was born. The little girl was but three years old when her mother, widowed and in poverty, returned to the home of her aged father in Scotland. There, first as the humble village school-mistress, and then as the admired head of a popular city boarding school, Mrs. Graham brought up her children in the fear of God and with a view to their extended usefulness in after life. The youthful Joanna, now the playmate of Walter Scott, now the pet companion of the pious Lady Glenorchy, now pupil in a fashionable French boarding school at Rotterdam, and now assistant in her mother's celebrated school in New York City, was preparing by her varied experiences for that useful after-life, which so eminently exemplified all the Christian virtues, and which was protracted to so good and green an old age. Mrs. Bethune enjoyed till far into mature life, that priceless blessing, the love, example and companionship of an educated, Christian mother. They were associated together in the establishment and support of some of the most important charitable institutions of New York City.

These memoirs are a fit offering from a good and gifted son to the memory of a worthy and devoted mother. They furnish a lesson to young women exposed to the allurements of fashionable life, an example to Christian mothers anxious for the religious welfare of their children, and words of cheer and sympathy to aged pilgrims waiting in faith for their heavenly inheritance.

The Students' France. A History of France, from the earliest times, to the establishment of the second Empire in 1862. Illustrated by Engravings on wood. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1862.

THE series of works to which this belongs, is designed to be succinct enough to furnish text books for students, without falling into the barrenness of mere epitomes, and to be comprehensive enough for a full portraiture, without burdening the mind with details. The History

of France is the best of the series. It begins with the very beginning of French National existence, and descends to our own day. It chiefly follows, as authority, the history of M. Henri Martin, though with copious references to other authors.

To most of the chapters are added Notes and Illustrations, which will be especially serviceable to inquisitive students.

The Results of Emancipation. By AUGUSTIN COCHIN, Ex-Maire and Municipal Councillor of Paris. Work crowned by the Institute of France (Academie Francaise). Translated by Mary L. Booth, translator of Count de Gasparin's works on America, etc. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co.

The party which in France (and also in England) had always denounced the negro emancipation of the colonies had for some time been taking advantage of the natural reaction of opinion from one extreme to another, when, at the breaking out of our civil war, they became bold and decided in their public utterances. The London Times in 1861 ventured to say: "Our grandfathers committed the crime (of enslaving the blacks), our fathers repented it, to us belongs reflection; we may perhaps be mistaken." Nothing could be more opportune for both Europe and America than the publication of the work of M. Cochin. It deals with the whole question of negro emancipation in the double light of Christianity and of political economy. It is written in the spirit of a Christian, with the freshness of a man who is heartily in earnest, and with the scientific exactness of a statician and political economist.

The dedicatory introduction of twenty-four pages, addressed to M. le Duc de Broglie, is written as only an eloquent Frenchman can write, and the results of emancipation are detailed with a clearness and fullness of proof which are possible only after the most painstaking and laborious investigation. In the preparation of his work the author enjoyed the sympathy and co-operation of some of the leading minds of France, and on its publication was greeted with the most flattering testimonials from the Institute of France and from the Pope, who conferred on him an order of knighthood. We trust that the translator will by all means give us the second volume of the original work, which treats of the state of religion, of politics, of morals, of justice, of literature and of wealth, in the countries which still persist in supporting the institution of slavery. The volume we have will do a great and good work at the present juncture of our national affairs, the second volume would add to the effectiveness of the first.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Origin and History of the English Language, and of the Early Literature it embodies. By GEORGE P. MARSH, author of "*Lectures on the English Language*," etc. New York: Charles Scribner, 1862.

WE have more than once commended to the attention of our readers. *Marsh's Lectures on the English Language*, delivered in New York, and published by Mr. Scribner in 1861. That work has reached its fourth edition, and has been introduced as a text-book into some of the higher educational institutions of this country, and still more widely into those of England. The lectures which compose the present volume were delivered at the Lowell Institute in Boston, in the winter of 1860-1861. The former course, though not strictly introductory to these, yet properly precede and prepare the way for a more profitable study of them.

In treating of the Origin and History of the English Language, Mr. Marsh has a philological rather than a linguistic end in view. He traces the history and pedigree of words as living actors in literature, rather than as dead symbols in lexical genealogical tables. He views language as possessed of an informing soul, to be studied in its movements and changes, and not as interred in literature, to be dug up in separate members for comparison and reconstruction. In other words, he discusses language as connected with the intellectual, social and moral life of the people who speak it, rather than in any mere abstract view of it, whether grammatical, etymological, or any other, although these, of course, appear in its historical developement. His method is philosophical, inasmuch as the science of philology logically precedes that of linguistics, and any linguistic attainment arrived at independent of the aid of comparative philology, must be superficial in process, and untrustworthy in result. These sciences are still in their infancy in this country, and unwarrantable generalizations, baseless theories, and unsound systems will gradually disappear as scholarship in this direction advances. This work will not only do much towards stimulating to a wider range of research and to more accurate investigation, but itself opens a road and sets up guide posts for the easier progress of the scientific explorer.

Mr. Marsh treats, in three lectures, of the origin and composition of the Anglo-Saxon people and of their language; of Anglo-Saxon vocabulary, literature, and grammar, and of Semi-Saxon literature.

Then, in two lectures, he treats of the English language and literature in the two periods, 1st, from the middle of the thirteenth to the middle of the fourteenth century, and 2nd, from 1350 to the time of the author of *Piers Ploughman*. Lecture VII. treats of the author of *Piers Ploughman* and his imitators; lecture VIII. of Wycliffe and his school; and lecture IX. of Chaucer and Gower. The remaining lectures trace the history of the English language and literature from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the time of Caxton, from that time to the ascension of Elizabeth, and thence to the close of her reign, when the English language and English literature ceased to exercise that reciprocal influence which depends on a synchronous growth, and makes the history of one necessary to the history of the other. These lectures fill a place in English literature hitherto unoccupied. While to a very limited number of scholars in this country they may present little new, they are far in advance of the philological attainments not only of the great mass of literary men, but of many also who make pretensions to linguistic learning. Rich in literary lore, and scientific in plan and treatment, they are yet neither too "learned" nor too "dry" for any who have sufficient culture to be attracted by the subject of which they treat. No one interested in the study of the English language, and desirous of speaking or writing it with accuracy and elegance, will fail to avail himself of the helps which Mr. Marsh has furnished.

The Book-Hunter, etc. By JOHN HILL BURTON, with additional notes by RICHARD GRANT WHITE. New York: Sheldon & Co., 1863.

WITH whatever indignation our Union-loving souls may be stirred at the mention of Blackwood's Magazine, we have yet to thank it for two charming books but just now issued from the New York press, the *Chronicles of Carlingford* and the *Book-Hunter*. The essays, unlike the story, grew to maturity outside the nursery of vigilant Maga. Desultory thoughts, gathered at first about book collectors and book readers, grew by development and by accretion, to a book of generous proportions and attractive features. With some skilful effects in the way of order and arrangement it still retains much of its original desultoriness of aspect. One is reminded in reading it of the *Essays of Elia*. Its thoughts are clothed with modern grace in habits suggestive of older fashions. It is as if its author had been rummaging in some library of quaint old black-letter books till his pen were under the spell of the *genius loci*. He is in warm sympathy with the class of whom he

treats, and with deprecatory humor conciliates for them the favor of such rational people as might be disposed "to transfer them from the class of free self-regulators to that of persons under treatment?" He adds—"It is, therefore, with some little misgiving that one sets down anything that may betray a brother's weakness, and lay bare the diagnosis of a human frailty. Indeed the bad name that proverbially hangs the dog has already been given to it, for biblio-mania is older in the technology of this kind of nosology than dipsomania, which is now understood to be an almost established ground for seclusion and deprivation of the management of one's own affairs. There is one ground of consolation however—the people who, being all right themselves, have undertaken the duty of keeping in order the rest of the world, have far too serious a task in hand to afford time for idle reading. There is a good chance, therefore, that this little book may pass them unnoticed, and the harmless class on whose peculiar frailties the present occasion is taken for devoting a gentle and kindly exposition, may yet be permitted to go at large."

If the author be not himself a subject of the malady which he so well describes, his amused reader is yet more than once provoked to admonish him in the words of the old proverb, "Physician, heal thyself," and modestly to inquire if his very patronymic is not suggestive of old books and manuscripts, and does not carry with it the suspicion of hereditary taint; if it is not, indeed, a name, which, however else associated, seems, by its own virtue, to have run to all sorts of literary whimsies and curious learning. There involuntarily arise such significant questions as—Was not Wm. G. Burton, gentleman, prone to *Biblical Researches*, and Wm. Burton, bookseller, to *Researches into the Customs of Ancient Eastern Nations*? Did not Wm. E. Burton, comedian, prove his propensity in a *Unique Collection of Humorous Articles*, and Wm. Burton, clergyman, in *Queer Sermons*, and Wm. Burton, physician, in a noted book on *Viper Catchers*? Was not Wm. Burton, son, an antiquary, and Wm. Burton, father, a hopeless antiquary, and was not Robert Burton, brother, the author of the *Anatomy of Melancholy*? and, to change the Christian appellation, was not John Burton, physician, a stark antiquary, and Edward Burton, divine, given to *Christian Antiquities*, and Edmund Burton, lawyer, addicted to *Classical Researches*, and so on to the last of the Burtons, even to the learned author of the *Law of Real Property*, who, most aberrant of them all, clothes his thoughts in so close a fit of language that not a word can be taken out without spoiling the suit, and to Mr. Richard

Burton, the writer of curious books of unaccustomed travel, who has been introduced to American readers by their friend Bayard Taylor. We have known Mr. John Hill Burton only as the very sane author of two valuable books—the Life of David Hume, and a History of Scotland from 1688 to 1755. We have hitherto detected in him no tinge of the Burton blood; but now we begin to grow inquisitive as to his line of descent, and to wonder if any of the rare old libraries of those queer Burton book-lovers have fallen to his inheritance. However that may be, his own book is full of such odd, out of the way scraps of literary lore, historical, biographical and anecdotal, as are to be picked up in the curious old collections of a line of unmitigated book-hunters.

In the first part of his book Mr. Burton treats of the nature and the functions of book-hunters. He has drawn under fictitious cognomens, with a pen cut to delicate point and dipped in humor, though sometimes carelessly carried, various representative portraits for which certain "mighty book-hunters" have been made to sit. Of one of these, whom he calls Archdeacon Meadow, he writes:

"You see him now—tall, straight and meagre, but with a grim dignity in his air which warms into benignity as he inspects a pretty, little, clean Elzevir, or a tall, portly Stephens, concluding his inward estimate of the prize with a peculiar grunting chuckle, known by the initiated to be an important announcement. This is no doubt one of the milder and more inoffensive types, but still a thoroughly confirmed and obstinate case. Its parallel to the classes who are to be taken charge of by their wiser neighbors is only too close and awful; for have not sometimes the female members of his household been known on occasion of some domestic emergency—or, it may be, for the mere sake of keeping the lost man out of mischief—to have been searching for him on from book-stall unto book-stall, just as mothers, wives, and daughters of other lost men hunt them through their favorite taverns? Then, again, can one forget that occasion of his going to London to be examined by a Committee of the House of Commons, when he suddenly disappeared with all his money in his pocket, and returned penniless, followed by a wagon containing 372 copies of rare editions of the Bible? * * * It is a matter of extreme anxiety to his friends, and, if he have a well-constituted mind, of sad misgiving to himself, when the collector buys his first *duplicate*. It is like the first secret dram swallowed in the forenoon—the first pawning of the silver spoons—or any other terrible first step downwards you may please to liken it to. There is no hope for the patient after this. It rends at once the veil of decorum spun out of the flimsy sophisms by which he has been deceiving his friends and partially deceiving himself, into the belief that his previous purchases were necessary, or at all events serviceable, for professional and literary purposes. He now becomes shameless and hardened; and it is observable in the career of this class of unfortunates, that the first act of duplicity is immediately followed by an access of the disorder, and a reckless

abandonment to its propensities. The Archdeacon had long passed this stage ere he crossed my path, and had become thoroughly hardened. He was not remarkable for local attachment, and in moving from place to place, his spoil packed in innumerable great boxes, sometimes followed him, to remain unreleased during the whole period of his tarrying in his new abode, so that they were removed to the next stage of his journey through life with modified inconvenience."

Only one of these portraits, the very amusing one of De Quincy, "Papaverius," has been identified by the public. The latter part of the book is devoted to "Book Clubs and Book Club Literature." The author, roaming through wide fields of literature and searching into their less explored corners, has brought forth a miscellaneous store of "specimens," which must be new and full of interest to the majority of American readers. His book is fitted especially to men of books, and there are few such who would not enjoy, especially with a congenial friend or two, its pleasant humor, its delicate satire as well as its curious facts of literature and its practical hints and cautions to the seeker after rare and valuable books.

Mr. White's notes, though sometimes weak, add to the sprightliness of the volume, and in several instances gratify our national pride by correcting errors both of opinion and fact which the author had fallen into in regard to literary matters in this country.

Vesper, by Madame the Countess De Gasparin. Translated from the third French edition by Mary L. Booth. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1863.

THIS little book is composed of a series of pictures, sometimes rural, sometimes domestic, but always sweet, innocent, tender, and *Frenchy*. They have a singular charm in producing the double effect of plain, truthful portrayals, and of finely wrought fancy sketches. The same character is a common-place individual often met, and an "ideal" to be remembered like a bit of genuine poetry. The reader seems with Madame De Gasparin herself, to have a double vision, by which he sees things dignified and beautiful through a kind of poetical *glamour*, and at the same time plain and on their proper level, by the "light of common day." She presents the ideal in the actual, poetry in prose, and harmonizes the two by the pervading grace of a feminine and Christian spirit.